

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF SASKATCHEWAN
Third Session — Seventeenth Legislature
6th Day

Thursday February 1, 1973.

The Assembly met at 2:30 o'clock p.m.
On the Orders of the Day.

WELCOME TO STUDENTS

Hon. E.L. Tchorzewski (Humboldt): — Mr. Speaker, I should like through you, to draw the attention of this House to a group of students who are seated in the west gallery from Laurier School in Annaheim in the Humboldt constituency. They left rather early this morning and have had an interesting day touring various interesting spots in the city. I am sure that all of the Members of this House hope that the quality of the debate here today, Mr. Speaker, will be such that the students can go away impressed with the parliamentary system of government. If that should prove not to be the case, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that they will go away at least having been entertained very adequately but I shall leave that up to the speakers who have to speak this afternoon.

I know that the Members of this House will join me in welcoming the students and Mr. Thiessen, their teacher, as well as Father George and the six parents who have accompanied them, in wishing them a very worthwhile trip to Regina and a very worthwhile stay in the Legislature.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to join my colleague from Humboldt in welcoming the students from Annaheim. Some people in this Chamber might wonder why I do this but Annaheim is the town where I was born and raised.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Rolfes: — They tell me it has made great progress since I left but it has received some recognition, as most of you I am sure are aware, from Doepher Industries which manufacture many farm implements. When I left it was known as the cleanest town on this side of the Manitoba border. One of the big reasons why it is the cleanest town is, of course, that there is no railroad so they don't have to worry about the political implications of railroad abandonment. But I'd like to join my colleague in welcoming the students here and the parents. The students don't look too familiar but most of the parents do.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.R. Kowalchuk (Melville): — Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure, Sir, through you, to welcome and take this privilege of welcoming 60 Grade Eight students from Melville from the St. Henry Separate School. They are seated in the gallery to the west, Sir. Now these 60 students are accompanied by two of

St. Henry staff members, Miss T. Anderson and Bob Reid. They came to this city and Legislature in two buses driven by two young but very careful bus drivers, Kevin Graham and his brother, Blair. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that these Grade Eight students will have an exciting day and hopefully they will derive a better understanding of what goes on in this Legislature and a general idea as to what is meant by debate. Today's speakers are slated to speak both from the Government and the Opposition sides of the House. I am sure that all Members of this Legislature welcome these young Canadians, wishing them a worthwhile visit in this Legislature and a safe journey back to Melville.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J. Wiebe (Morse): — Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce to you and through you 35 students located in the east gallery from the Briercrest Bible School. I should like to refer to it more as the Caronport Bible School as I go by it every week when I go back and forth into Regina. They are accompanied by Carl Weinbauer. A number of my relatives attend the Briercrest Institute. I don't know whether my glasses need to be fixed or not but I can't recognize any of them up there. If you are there, please wave, or maybe they don't want to admit it.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Wiebe: — I understand you will be meeting with the Hon. Mr. Wood at 3 o'clock this afternoon. I can assure you that you will enjoy that meeting very much. I should like to welcome you to the Legislature and hope that you have a very productive afternoon.

Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

ANNOUNCEMENT

SASKATCHEWAN COMPUTER UTILITY CORPORATION

Hon. E.L. Cowley (Minister of Finance): — Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have a brief announcement which I should like to make to the Members of the Legislature. On behalf of the Government I am pleased to announce the establishment of a new Crown corporation to consolidate and develop computer facilities now operated independently by a number of government and government-funded organizations. The Saskatchewan Computer Utility Corporation has been created under The Crown Corporations Act to permit an immediate start on planning, organization and staffing. New legislation is expected to be introduced during the current Session to establish the utility as an independent Crown agency. The formation of the utility was recommended by a committee set up by the Government which consisted of representatives of the larger user agencies. Mr. Speaker, it is our belief that the establishment of this new Crown corporation will result in better service at reduced cost to the people of Saskatchewan.

I am also pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. Loyde Holmes as general manager of the Saskatchewan Computer Utility Corporation. His experience with computer use and

development in Saskatchewan plus his proven administration skills will be a real asset to the Computer Utility.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Hon. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Well, I just hope that Mr. Holmes gets some mileage out of this one, that's all I can say.

QUESTIONS

EXTENSION OF SERVICES OF INFORMATION SERVICES

Mr. D.G. Steuart (Leader of the Opposition): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Premier (Mr. Blakeney) and it is in regard to a letter I received recently from the Department of Information Services, informing me that the Government had decided to extend its services in the Photographic and Art Service Division to all Members of the Legislative Assembly. I am informed that during the present Session each MLA may arrange for two 60-second sound-on-film news clips for distribution throughout Saskatchewan and that Cabinet Ministers and the Leader of the Opposition may have five such news clips produced. I should like to thank the Government for the kind thoughts but I wish to point out that this means during the present Session the Opposition may produce 33 clips or news clips while the Government with 16 Cabinet Ministers will produce 133 news clips. For every four news clips for the Government, the Opposition will have one. Well, now, is this the way the Government intends to control political costs? Does the Government intend to control political advertising by using the taxpayers' money and then allocating it so the Government receives a four to one advantage. I think this is totally and absolutely unfair and the goal is obvious. By controlling the Opposition spending, by disseminating information on a four to one ratio for the Government, it is intended to perpetuate the NDP Government of course. Now, my question, Mr. Speaker — and just cool down I'll ask my question

An Hon. Member: — mess around

Mr. Steuart: — Well you have to mess around when you get this kind of garbage handed to you by the Government because what we are afraid of is that this is exactly what the Government intends to do when it comes to allocating government spending. We represent 43 per cent of the people in this province and we should have a split on at least 43 to 53. My question to the Premier is, will he review this decision and put it on something resembling a fair basis.

Hon. A.E. Blakeney (Premier): — Well, Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Leader of the Opposition can't find an occasion to make his speeches in the proper form. As he knows, his remarks were totally out of order and I don't intend to answer them in substance because I would have to be equally out of order and I have some respect for the rules of this House. I will, however, if he wishes me to say so, take his remarks into consideration. I will give them every consideration, all the consideration they are worth.

Mr. Steuart: — I should just like to ask a supplementary question.

Mr. Speaker: — I cannot allow a supplementary question because I did not accept it as a question, I accepted it as a statement and an answer back, so I can't permit a debate on it.

STUDY BY SPRINGATE AND ASSOCIATES

Mr. Steuart: — The Premier promised me last week that Monday he would inform myself and this House if he would table a study made by Springate and Associates. Now if you have the same intention of answering this question as you had to the last question, I don't know when we will ever get it. It is now Thursday. Have you found out whether you intend to give us that information, Mr. Premier, or not?

Mr. Blakeney: — Mr. Speaker, when the matter of the Springate Report arose I said I would look into it and see whether there was any reason why it shouldn't be tabled. I have looked into the matter. I found that the report that we received was a preliminary report. As I indicated in my remarks in this House yesterday, it was a preliminary report, it was distributed to certain people in the Government and also outside the Government, particularly to the Simpson Timber Company and to the Prince Albert Pulp Company, Ltd., and we asked them for their comments. We, meaning Mr. Springate, asked them for their comments. Their comments either are being or have been tendered to Mr. Springate and he proposes to file a final report shortly and I think it will be very shortly. It seems to me that under those circumstances it would be better for us to file the report in its final form. If the Member thinks otherwise he can put a motion on the Order Paper and we will debate the desirability of filing the interim report. That, however, is the facts. I did not wish to take the time of the House to give him those facts earlier because on each day we were pressed with respect to radio time, as indeed we are today.

ADJOURNED DEBATES

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

The Assembly resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion by Mr. H.H. Rolfes (Saskatoon Nutana South) and the proposed amendment thereto by Mr. McIsaac (Wilkie).

Mr. A.R. Guy (Athabasca): — Mr. Speaker, before adjourning the debate last night I spent considerable time on reviewing the Athabasca by-election of last fall. I did this for two reasons, one, information tabled in this House shows the Government spent more than \$6,000 of the taxpayers' money through recounts, controverted elections and so on to bring about this by-election; secondly, it was a typical example of the arrogant attitude of Premier Blakeney and the NDP that any action is forgivable if it is intended for the political success of the NDP. I have pointed out that never in the history of this province had a by-election been so poorly organized and managed as it was in this case. Most of the blame for the inefficiency and mismanagement and confusion must lie with the Premier. For though

he knew from the middle of May that a by-election would be necessary he took no steps to set up the required election machinery until the writ was issued in August. The Returning Officer was not appointed until that time. When the Premier expects a man who has never been involved in elections or knew nothing about the vastness of the constituency and had to get polling clerks, enumerators, typed lists, distribute them and make all the arrangements in 28 days, it is unbelievable that he would expect that from that man. From the day the by-election was called we had a continual battle to keep the election officials operating within the terms of the Act. Advance Polls that had been established for several years were denied this time for no reason. Others that were established were cancelled on the day they were supposed to open. The Returning Officer refused to establish polls that had been proclaimed on the official proclamation but attempts were made to set up additional polls as late as one day before the election. Many of them were questionable and certainly without any consultation with the other candidates other than the NDP. Hundreds were left off the voters' lists, and in one case four polls were included on one list, with the result that if not corrected each person could have had four votes.

Perhaps the most glaring discrepancy was in the printing of the ballots. The Election Act states clearly that the names will appear with the surname last and thus we were surprised that the NDP literature carried sample ballots with the surname first. However, when the official ballots were printed with the surnames first, we knew then we were the victims of an NDP plot.

It is hard to imagine any government or political party knowingly printing the ballots in an illegal manner and then asking the other candidates to support them in their wrongdoing. These irregularities could all have been avoided if the Premier had been interested in the election being carried out in a fair and just manner, regardless of the outcome. However, his desire for an NDP victory led him to overlook the interests of the local people. This contempt shown by the Premier and his party played no small part in the final result on election day.

I should at this time like to say thank you to all my supporters in the Athabasca constituency, with special thanks to all those workers on the local and provincial level who gave willingly of their time on behalf of myself and the Liberal Party. Never before has any political party used the taxpayers' dollar to finance a political campaign to the extent that Premier Blakeney and his colleagues did in the by-election. Cabinet Ministers, executive assistants, government employees, individually and collectively, criss-crossed the constituency from June until the election day.

The Minister of Northern Saskatchewan, Mr. Bowerman, was the worst offender. The top priority of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan was no longer to get the department established but to elect the NDP candidate. To that end his executive assistant, Mr. Bill Allen, who was paid from the public purse, was a full-time campaign manager for the NDP. Jason Shaw, Tony Wood, both employed by the same department were regular and constant campaign workers in the NDP Committee rooms, as were two of the members of the so-called non-political Northern Advisory Council.

Perhaps the most barefaced example of misuse of public funds was when the Premier and his full Cabinet visited nearly every poll in my constituency just a few days before the election was called. This was nothing more than pure political blackmail, as everywhere they went, the stock reply to questions was, "A decision will be made after the by-election." In other words saying if the NDP is elected we will consider it but if they aren't don't bother us. This flying circus was followed during the campaign by greatly increased advertising, publicity and radio broadcasts, again all at the taxpayers' expense. Well, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the most unprecedented campaign ever waged in this province at public expense, election day came, went, the NDP candidate was defeated. In fact, there were 482 more people voted against the NDP than voted for them compared to only twelve just one year earlier. This should be certain proof that the people of Athabasca did not appreciate the type of campaign that the Premier and the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan ran, nor the trail of broken promises that were left over from the 1971 campaign.

Mr. Speaker, it is this political interference and manoeuvring along with the failure to consult with the local people that has brought the Department of Northern Saskatchewan to the brink of disaster. When the Department was established last spring, two commitments were made by the Premier and the Minister of Northern Saskatchewan to this Legislature and the people of northern Saskatchewan. One was that northern people would administer the department and two, that local people would be consulted and through elected representatives would have some voice in determining the direction in the approach that the department would take in establishing the programs that would be implemented.

Neither of these commitments which are basic to the success of this department have been kept. The Government has completely broken faith with the people of the North. You will also remember that in anticipation of a by-election in my constituency the department was set up in haste without prior planning or without taking time to consult northern people. For the same reason amendments that I moved during last session which would have provided local representation and consultation were defeated for purely political motives. I have today given notice that I intend to introduce a bill that will overcome the weaknesses that I have mentioned. I ask now that the by-election is over that for the good of the people of northern Saskatchewan that the Government put petty politics aside and support our legislation.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Let's look at the administration of the Department of the North. At the top of course is the Minister, Mr. Bowerman, who it is true has some northern experience but after being a failure in the fishing industry he left the North in despair in 1966 to farm, a vocation which he pursued until his appointment five years later as Minister of Northern Saskatchewan. His executive assistant had no association with the North, other than through the campaign. The deputy and assistant deputy are Wilf Churchman and Art Towill, both former employees of the Department of Natural Resources. Certainly the idea of local consultation or participation by northern people was never an idea they fostered when they were here before and

one that they will fight against implementing now.

The executive assistant to Mr. Churchman is H.M. Scott, and to Mr. Towill is Jerry Hammersmith — one of those NDP who ran for the nomination in the by-election. Of these six top administrative positions, not one can claim northern residency prior to his appointment and not one was on the recommendation of local people.

The next layer of the bureaucracy is no better. If there was one position in the new department where a northern resident should have been appointed, it was as Director of Policy and Planning. But who got that position? None other than Brian Hill, former resident of Eastern Canada and former research officer in the Planning and Research Branch in the Executive Council under the Premier.

Other directors include Ed Breeze, Director of Continuing Education, who spent the last two years in Ghana; Eric Cousins, from outside the province, Director of Information; Glen Lindgren, Director of Education; J.B. Morgan, Director of Personnel and Training; and M. Wood, Director of Administration. Of these six at the director level, only Mr. Lindgren, who as Official Agent of the NDP candidate has to be considered a political appointment, has ever lived in the North which he is administering, and the others had never even seen the North until their appointment and forced move to La Ronge.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, throughout these 12 top administrative appointments you will note there is not one person of Indian ancestry, although three-quarters of the people to be administered are people of Indian ancestry. Is it any wonder, with a bureaucracy like this, that the people of northern Saskatchewan are unhappy.

This unhappiness has been shown in many ways over the last few months — the NDP loss in the by-election, the picketing of the NDP convention by the Métis Society, who rightfully believe their call for consultation and involvement has been ignored, and requests from northern people that Churchman and Towill be replaced.

A year has gone by and the only recognizable achievements by the Department of Northern Saskatchewan has been in the building of this top heavy, bureaucracy and their political participation in the by-election. The actions of this bureaucracy has come increasingly under scrutiny by people concerned with the social and economic development of northern Saskatchewan.

Mr. Speaker, we have recently received information that suggests that the time has come when an investigation should be made of the attitudes and administration of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan.

I have here a copy of a letter that was sent to the Premier of this province with a copy to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart), concerning the Ile a La Crosse and La Loche areas. I wish to quote several passages from this letter from Sister Blatz, Superior General of the Ursuline Order. We have

talked to the Sister who is gravely concerned with what she found on a recent stay in this area. This is a letter dated January 25th:

Dear Mr. Blakeney:

Recently I returned from a trip to Ile-a-La-Crosse and La Loche after spending several days in each location. I was appalled to see the change in attitude of the native people toward the white man. If anything relations have considerably deteriorated in the last two years, more especially during the last two months. I would without hesitation lay the immediate cause of this at the feet of some of your (our) civil servants in the area. What is the purpose of the DNS? Is this purpose being achieved or is it being used as a cover up for misuse and misappropriation of public funds, grants by civil servants who seem to have unlimited authority. Why purposely stir up natives to hostility and disillusionment? Who will be responsible for the irresponsibility of some of the hired and publicly paid government officials, DNS representatives, adult education workers, social welfare agents etc? Is it part of the function of the newly formed DNS or other civil servants to hold public but closed meetings prior to the actual meeting? The purpose of these pre meetings being to arouse the discontent of the Indian and Métis. Why would a letter be circulated by Mr. Jerry Hammersmith to confirm the meeting before hand and to notify only certain members of the official group? In the letter to which I refer there are some quite audacious and irresponsible proposals made and references that are amusing to an informed public but to use such half-truths with a largely uneducated and unsuspecting people is a dastardly and low punch for someone who because of his position should know better.

I am writing to you, Mr. Premier, and hope that you as our present Premier would personally investigate the work of officials in the northern areas. There are many taxpayers who would absolutely refuse to support the work some of these men think they are doing in the name of assisting the Indian and Métis to come into their own. It is with deep regret that I see politics widening the rift between the white population and the Indian and Métis.

She concludes:

It is my earnest hope that you will see fit to look into the situation with thoroughness, sincerity and a keen sense of responsibility.

Respectfully yours, Sister Hermena Blatz, Sister Superior General.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are serious allegations from a Sister whose integrity and concern for native people cannot be questioned. In view of this request to investigate the situation, I would sincerely ask the Premier today to immediately establish a Legislative Committee of Members from both sides of this House, to investigate the work of the Department of Northern Saskatchewan with particular reference to the points specifically raised in this letter.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I am sure that Members of this committee could be excused from this House for several days to go into the North for first-hand observation and consultation with local people. If, and I say if, then it is found that the situation is as serious as suggested it would then be the Government's responsibility to take immediate action to correct it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — You know if the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech were aware of the situation, and not only this particular situation, in northern Saskatchewan they would not have been so excited about the funds that were being made available to the Department of Northern Saskatchewan for housing and municipal sewer and water projects. I would remind the two Hon. Members that for two summers since they became the Government, these programs were non-existent.

La Ronge completed the first phase of their water and sewer project two years ago with substantial assistance from the Liberal Government. Since then, although they have asked many times, they have received no assistance from the NDP and are now two years behind schedule.

The Government's move into the prospecting field is not a new program. It was unsuccessful prior to 1964 — it was unsuccessful last year — there is no reason to believe it will be any more successful in the future. When companies, large and small have spent tens of thousands of dollars and experienced and highly trained geologists, technicians and prospectors making use of the latest in technological methods and equipment have had only marginal success, the Government is rather naive to suggest they can take a man off the street, give him a two-week prospector's course, fly him into the bush with a pick, shovel and compass and expect success. It would be far more practical to provide assistance and incentives to companies with expertise and experience. The chance of success would be greater and the taxpayers' risk would be smaller.

There is no question there is mineral wealth still to be discovered. Many promising prospects were staked under our incentive plan that need extensive surveys and drilling but this will not be done under the proposed program of this Government.

The NDP demonstrated last year that they are not concerned with helping small mining companies. If they had been, they would have taken the opportunity when Anglo-Rouyn phased out their operation to assist Studer Mines and other companies in the area. Studer Mines presented a reasonable proposal supported by the La Ronge and Prince Albert Chamber of Commerce and others, including a former NDP MLA from this House.

Again, Premier Blakeney and the Mineral Resources Minister preferred to play politics. They didn't want to say "No", while the by-election was on, so they kept up a cat and mouse game of saying, 'We are looking at it — we'll tell you next Tuesday what we are going to do'. Tuesday would come, 'We require further studies'. I tell you once the by-election was over it didn't

take long to complete the studies and give a resounding "No" to the Studer organization and the local people.

We know the decision had already been made months before that the Government planned to take over the prospecting and mining field and there would be no room for small or private companies in this organization or this operation.

The NDP approach will be costly to the province but, of course, with dozens of party hacks administering the program they couldn't care less.

Like other Members, I was pleased to see the reference to ecological and environmental studies being made before any power dams are being built in the North. I hope this is true, but I am afraid this announcement is only a death-bed repentance.

We must look at it in its proper perspective, Mr. Minister of the Environment. Last summer at the Elizabeth Falls site at Stony Rapids, they spent hundreds of thousands of dollars testing for footings, for construction material and so on. Why spend that kind of money, before ecological and environmental studies had been completed, unless the decision had already been made to proceed.

We also know that studies made by government agencies will tell the Government whatever they want to be told. I would be far more reassured if the Government announced studies by outside and independent consultants and made these studies available before any public hearings are held.

As my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) said, there is no need to destroy the beauty and heritage of northern Saskatchewan, by building power dams which, I suspect, would see most of their power diverted to Manitoba. Regardless of what happens now, and regardless of this death-bed repentance, due to the lack of planning and co-ordination there is going to be several million dollars of unnecessary expense borne by the taxpayers of this province.

Now I should like to turn to some of the remarks made by the Premier. I suppose by now, the Premier will take no responsibility for anything he said yesterday or Tuesday night. It is unfortunate that the Premier has taken the position that he can make a statement one day, deny it the next and remarks will be forgotten. We had a typical example the other day when the Member for Morse (Mr. Wiebe) asked him to clarify where he had seen recommendations from the Special Committee on farm land ownership. The Premier chose instead of answering the question to flippantly reply: "I don't take any responsibility for what appears in the Leader-Post". The Press however have become wise to the Premier and in most cases they take his statements on tape so there will be no mistakes. This was true in this case as a reply of the tape shows that the Premier definitely stated: "I have seen a preliminary draft which was shown to me informally".

Now, the fact that Premier Blakeney deliberately misled this House and in so doing, falsely accused the Leader-Post of poor reporting is bad enough; but the really serious irregularity which this incident discloses shakes the integrity and value of every Special Legislative Committee that this Legislature has established.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — As you know, four or five of these committees have been criss-crossing the province at great public expense getting the views of Saskatchewan people. These committees are made up of Members from both sides of the House and their responsibility is to report to this Legislature not to the Cabinet or the Premier.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — If this is going to be the policy followed, then the whole principle and very foundation of these Legislative Committees has been shaken and their usefulness as a reflection of public sentiment will be gone.

I was rather surprised at the Premier's statements that the population was only down 10,000 as he said. He thinks that the population loss is stemmed and that he is happy that employment is up. From a man who 18 months before promised to stem the flow of people from Saskatchewan and was going to wage an untiring battle against unemployment, these are strange words.

It is true that more are seeking jobs as he says, but to our knowledge the only ones finding them are those filling the 783 positions provided in last year's budget. Not everyone in Saskatchewan has an NDP membership to qualify for these jobs.

Record wheat sales, strong livestock prices and the two-price system have provided the strongest farm economy for years. But still the people continue to pour out of the province. The reason being, of course, that while Ottawa and Otto Lang have had some success in stabilizing the agricultural industry, Premier Blakeney has failed miserably to do the same for industry, business and resource development.

Since the NDP Government took over in July 1971, unemployment has risen month by month. The Premier also took exception to the figures we were using regarding the rise in the income tax rate. All I want to say is the people of Saskatchewan know Ottawa gave them three per cent off, the NDP took it away from them. Then added insult to injury by adding another three per cent to their income tax this year.

The Premier then attempted to confuse everyone with a long dissertation regarding Carling's Brewery. The only question we want to know is why did he reduce the penalty if it was such a serious offence as he stated. It was obvious yesterday that Premier Blakeney still thinks that the pulp mill is a good political issue. I am surprised to hear him say that it is not and never will be the policy of an NDP government to invite outsiders to harvest our resources. This is not what Premier Schreyer says. You all know the fiasco of the Churchill Falls Industry pulp mill in Manitoba. But they have now got it back on track after spending millions of the taxpayers' money. This is what Schreyer said:

He feels the pulp and paper complex has been a net benefit to the economy, looking at the whole of Manitoba, the jobs, the revenue, the native people.

He said:

If I had been Premier I certainly would have been making approaches first to the Canadian or North American pulp and paper manufacturers.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it is strange that in view of these comments from the NDP Premier of Manitoba it is obvious that pulp mills are not the monsters that Premier Blakeney sees them to be. And if the Premier had taken a little more time and considered the benefits in jobs, revenue and secondary industry, without trying to make a political issue of it, he could have, after the election was over, made a decision on facts rather than fiction.

History will show that the whole northwest area was condemned to existing on social welfare on the basis of an NDP political decision with no concern for the people in the area concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I have several more things that I should like to say about the Throne Speech but I am sure they will be covered by my colleagues. It is enough to say that the Premier who has had 18 months has wavered at the cross roads, but in this Speech has crossed the Rubicon, and is taking us down the socialist path which I am convinced will lead to our ultimate destruction.

For that reason I cannot support the motion but will support the amendment.

And before sitting down I should like to table the letter from which I read.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Romanow (Attorney General): — Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Hon. Member would permit a question before he takes his chair.

Mr. Guy: — I would be delighted to have a question.

Mr. Romanow: — Would the Hon. Member kindly tell the House whether any member of the Regina Press community played back to him the tape of the Premier's remarks the Member referred to in his speech. If so who was the member of the Regina Press community and when?

Mr. Guy: — This is an interesting question, Mr. Speaker, that has come from the Attorney General. I take what I read in the Press the same, I think, as all Members of this Legislature should do, they way they are written. I have the clipping here and I will read it to you. It comes under the heading, "Premier under Attack for Comments to the Press."

Premier Blakeney was criticized in the Legislature Monday on the basis of a news report which quoted him stating he had seen a rough draft of the report of the Legislature Special Committee on Foreign Land Ownership. A tape recording of the Thursday Press Conference with Mr. Blakeney shows he says, "No final report has been

received by the Government.

However, he also stated (and this is on tape — and I take the word of the Press). I feel that the Press in this province does a tremendous job reporting the statements of all Members of this Legislature.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Guy: — I have been the subject of what I call some misrepresentations by the Press but I didn't stand up and complain about it. They have given me a good press when probably I deserved a poor press.

Mr. Romanow: — Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General has asked a question and I am going to answer it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order: I think the question was maybe out of order and the answer has been too far a field. I am going to call on the next speaker.

Mr. Guy: — Mr. Speaker

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order: I am ruling that any further

Mr. Guy: — The question was asked by the Attorney General and I am going to answer it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order! I am ruling that any further discussion at this time is out of order. A resolution can appear on the Order Paper and we can debate the issue, but we can't debate it at this time.

Mr. Guy: — We are being muzzled. He asked the question concerning the Press and I am prepared to stand up here and support the Press.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Guy: — If he had the right to ask the question I have the right to answer it.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order: Would the Hon. Member please obey the rules. I am going to call on the next Speaker without the Hon. Member becoming heated at this time.

Mr. L. Larson (Pelly): — Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether it is a penalty, whether it is a duty, an honor or a challenge to follow the Hon. Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy). I am inclined to believe that it is a penalty, after the diatribe and general attitude he

displayed yesterday afternoon and again today. I think that everyone is quite convinced that he represents the true characteristics of the Liberal Party.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — I was very interested, Mr. Speaker, in the new image that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) tried to display the other day. Really he wasn't at his usual best. He was trying to portray a new image.

The Member for Athabasca has certainly undone anything that he may have established.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — When I noticed the enthusiasm that has been shown by all the Members of the Opposition in support of the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy), I am sure that we now know for sure what the Liberal Party really stands for.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — There can be no doubt in anyone's mind as to where they stand.

You know I should like to say to the Member for Athabasca that he has no monopoly on this kind of diatribe and this kind of oratory. This is something that all of us can very easily and very effectively indulge in. However, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe that it has any particular place in this Legislature. I don't think it enhances any individual Member or the Legislature of Saskatchewan as a whole. I am reminded of what my father told me when I was a small boy.

I used to raise a lot of Cain out in the barn with the animals. He said, "You know it is all right son to use that kind of approach to animals but never, never Use it when you are confronting your fellowman." So I don't intend, this afternoon, to indulge in these types of tactics although I can tell my hon. friend from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) that I can do a pretty good job if he so desires and if I had so desired.

I want, on the other hand, Mr. Speaker, at this time to congratulate the Members from Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski) and Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor and Biggar (Mr. Cowley) on their appointments to the Cabinet.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — I also wish to congratulate the Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy) on his win in the by-election. I am sure that he has shown that he will live up to his usual self, his usual capacity. I am sure that the new Cabinet Ministers will serve very adequately and very well in the roles that they have been appointed to.

I want too, Mr. Speaker, to take this opportunity to offer a prayer of thanks for the people of the United States and the

February 1, 1973

people of Vietnam for the recently announced peace that has come to them. The peace follows years of struggle, years of suffering and sorrow that has prevailed in what has been described as the bloodiest and most barbaric war in the history of mankind. May they enjoy many years of uninterrupted peace.

I want, at this time as well, to salute the members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police on the occasion of their centennial. This world famous police force deserves the honor and respect that will be shown them. I invite all the people of Saskatchewan to join in the celebration and the welcoming of their Majesties to our fair province.

May I now spend a few minutes in speaking about my own constituency of Pelly. We are basically a mixed farming area, with cattle and hogs providing a substantial amount of the farm income.

It has been my privilege and honor to serve on behalf of the people of Pelly from 1964 to 1967 and again in 1971. Time does not permit a proper and worthy description of this beautiful part of Saskatchewan nor does it permit a proper description of the thrift and the character of its people. Suffice at this time to say we have beauty, we have history, we have wealth in our land, as well as pride, thrift, and character in our people. On behalf of my wife and myself a very sincere and humble thanks for the opportunity of serving. No tribute to the people of Pelly constituency would be complete without a mention of native citizens.

These are people who are struggling very hard and in their own way very successfully, to better their lot. I am completely aware of the hardships, aware of the real effort they are making to help themselves. I am proud to say there are some achievements and that they are taking a small part in the role of life and history in Saskatchewan.

I want to turn now for a few moments to the Throne Speech and its contents, as well as a short review of some of the achievements of the past year.

Undoubtedly, one of the major pieces of legislation to come before the last session was the establishment of the Land Bank. For the first time in our history it is now possible to transfer land from father to son, from one generation to the next without perpetual mortgages and debts that usually last for the lifetime of the son or the purchaser. The new FarmStart program will supplement the Land Bank as it is quite easily recognized that unless something is done to stabilize the income position of farmers the Land Bank will not solve this problem at all.

In spite of all the negative remarks that are being made about the Land Bank by the Liberal Opposition, it is very obvious that it is popular and is being made good use of and being accepted.

The Opposition know it is a good program and are deliberately trying to distort its intent and its possibilities. Every progressive program that has been started by this Government gets the same kind of treatment and judgment. It is a pity that that attitude has to prevail.

The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) is in a very precarious position. On the one hand he doesn't dare to condemn out-of-hand programs he knows that are good, on the other hand he has nothing better to offer by way of criticism than the old time worn, beat up and distorted cry of socialism. His defence of that very weak and impossible position is, "We will go along with it."

The importance of the FarmStart program is one that cannot be over-emphasized. The effects of what it can do will show up in the farming pattern of the future. As an industry agriculture must tune itself to market demands and food needs as they develop.

The markets and the demands of the world determine this. The prospects of the red meat markets are both exciting and challenging. The role that Saskatchewan farmers will play in this arena will to a large extent be determined by what we do now and by what steps we take to be in position to take advantage of the situation.

The importance of the slaughtering and meat processing industry in Canada is shown by the following facts.

The industry has sales of over \$2 billion annually and ranks third largest of all manufacturing industries. It ranks second in cost of materials used almost \$1.75 billion. It spends \$3.5 million every day on livestock purchased. It employs a total work force of 31,000 people. The industry pays \$228 million annually in salaries and wages. When it is borne in mind that the increase in red meats produced in Canada has risen from 2.4 billion pounds in 1962 to 3.4 billion in 1971, a fairly good idea of the potential in this sector of agriculture is realized.

The FarmStart program is based on the belief that Saskatchewan must be getting its fair share of this exciting market. Saskatchewan is one of the few places left on the North American Continent that has a real potential for livestock expansion.

The new program will not only help and supplement the Land Bank farmers but will be available to all farmers who wish to participate. This program is definitely a first insofar as some real and comprehensive assistance to agriculture is concerned.

All farmers at this time would be well advised to proceed into all-out wheat production with caution. Even though the Federal Government and the Minister of Agriculture encourage you to grow all you want, I would remind you of 1968 when a very cocky Pierre Elliott Trudeau said, "Grow all the wheat you want and we will sell it." The same Trudeau, who a couple of years later said, "Why should I sell your wheat?"

Farmers would be well advised to remember LIFT, the price Stabilization Bill, as well as the Task Force Report. All these programs of the Federal Liberal Government have had tragic effects on the farmers. Because of LIFT and its blackmail tactics, where you had to summer fallow in order to get a quota to sell what you already had on hand, many farmers are today out of grain.

The time is long overdue for a bold and comprehensive

attack on problems which confront family farm and rural communities. The real challenge now is for the Federal Government to make some basic commitment to supplement what this Provincial Government is doing.

The Liberals brought forth the Task Force. It said two out of three farms must disappear. The Liberals enforced LIFT. It forced farmers not to grow crops. As a result farm incomes were the lowest in years and now no grain to sell. The Conservatives were responsible for the MacPherson Commission Report which was the master plan for rail line and elevator abandonment on the Prairies.

Unless action is taken quickly this plan will be implemented. Then there was the Grains Income Stabilization Plan, introduced by the Liberals, supported by the Conservatives. Only by a concerted effort by Western farmers and the NDP was the plan withdrawn.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — The obvious intention was to stabilize poverty on the farms. Meanwhile farm income dropped till the farmers' share of the food dollar was reduced from 57 cents in 1949 to less than 38 cents today. Because of Liberal and Conservative farm policies of past years, farming has been on a steady decline.

This is shown by the drop from 85,600 farmers in Saskatchewan in 1966 to 76,900 in 1971. This is a decline of 10 percent in the past five years. Because of the insensitivity of the past Liberals and Conservatives the net farm income had dropped from \$572 million to \$356 million in 1971 or a drop of 41 per cent. This leaves the farm income below the recognized poverty line. In spite of this, the only solutions proposed by Liberals and Conservatives was to stabilize poverty in the farming industry.

What is not recognized in these attitudes is the importance of agriculture. Consider the following facts. More horsepower is used on Canadian farms than in Canadian industry. The Canadian food industry from farmer to consumer employs 35 per cent of domestic fuel requirements; 40 per cent of tires sold in Canada and 40 per cent of iron and steel used in Canada.

In spite of this the average net return to Saskatchewan farmers for a bushel of wheat in the crop year 1971-72 was \$1.28 per bushel.

In spite of all the lip service that has been given to industrial development, manufacturing, tourism and resource development, agriculture is and will be for a long time to come the backbone of all Saskatchewan's economy and the well-being of all its people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Larson: — This is fully recognized in the Throne Speech and in the programs of the New Democratic Party. The extension of Property Improvement Grants will certainly reflect the saving

on property tax. Extension of chiropractic services to all Saskatchewan citizens will benefit and be a real savings to many.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, but time does not permit me. In concluding, it's very obvious that I will be supporting the main motion but cannot support the amendment.

Mr. P. Mostoway (Hanley): — Mr. Speaker, I always thought that there were 15 Opposition Members. I see one, two, three, four, five of them in this House. Where did they all go?

Mr. Speaker, as the Member representing Hanley constituency, it gives me much pleasure in replying to the Throne Speech, which I consider to be indicative of this Government's desire to see Saskatchewan as one of the best places in which to live. I should like to touch on some of the points raised and also to mention certain areas of concern. But first I should like to thank my constituents in the towns and the rural area and southeast Saskatoon for the enthusiasm they have shown this past year in regard to their opinions, questions and requests for information.

At this time I should like to congratulate the Ministers of Finance, Social Services, and Youth and Consumer Affairs, on being appointed to Cabinet rank. I know all three are doing extremely well, and no amount of distortion by the Leader of the Opposition is going to fool the people of this province into believing otherwise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — I should also like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) on his victory at the polls recently. Last summer I had the pleasure of being in his constituency and I must say it is a beautiful part of the province, inhabited by people who pride themselves on being northerners and now when I recall the vastness of the constituency I realize that a by-election there can be costly in terms of dollars and cents. Yes, Mr. Speaker, very costly.

But I also want to thoroughly condemn the despicable behaviour of this same Member, the Member for Athabasca, for the brazen manner in which he disregarded your wishes a short time ago, Mr. Speaker, to have this House function democratically.

I must also congratulate the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) on a fine advertisement he had in last Monday's edition of the Star Phoenix. Now in it were listed, beside his picture, the various times when Opposition speakers would be on radio. However, directly underneath was a much larger advertisement which asked, in bold type, the question, "Which came first, the chicken or the egg?" Now gentlemen, I leave you to draw your own conclusions.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — I noticed the other day, the Leader of the Opposition criticized this Government for placing advertisements in our papers giving information on the new and expanded Property

Improvement Grant. Now to me it appeared that he thought this information should not be given to our citizens. I should have thought he learned his lesson after his government withheld information from the public and was soundly defeated.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — Mr. Speaker, this Government is committed to the principles of democracy and the giving of information to the public is just one of those principles.

I note with pleasure that this Government is continuing to prod the Federal Government into realizing that there is a Western Canada, that we are discriminated against in regard to freight rates, incentive grants under DREE, rail line abandonment, curtailment of postal service, high machinery costs and a host of other things. Somehow, I get the distinct feeling that if the election did nothing else for the Prime Minister, it did cause his hearing to improve dramatically.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — I note with pleasure that this Government is acting to provide funds for a co-operative alfalfa cubing plant in the irrigation area of Hanley constituency. Having talked to a number of farmers in that area recently, let me say that the provision of adequate funds in the initial stages will do much to ensure the success of this venture. From this operation a small number of new jobs will be created, many farmers will now be able to plan in a more meaningful way to help provide feed for cattle raisers and dairymen in this province.

The new program FarmStart will be welcomed by many. In this day when once again the tendency may be to concentrate on cereal crop production, such a program will do much in the interests of diversification.

Mr. Speaker, a short time ago an article appeared on page 1 of the Leader-Post stating that the Hon. Member from Morse (Mr. Wiebe) considered a reduction in Land Bank rates an admission of failure on the part of this Government. Now was he really serious? I ask you, Mr. Speaker, since when is a reduction in rates charged to Saskatchewan people considered to be a failure? All I can say in this regard, is that if he considers this reduction in rates to be a failure, I'd hate to speculate on what he and his colleagues would consider a success.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — I should like to turn my attention to one more concern in regard to agriculture and that is weight limits for farm trucks on our highways. Time after time, complaints have been brought to my attention, and over the past number of years to other Members. It's high time some changes were made here. I consider some of these regulations as being out of touch with reality and at times oppressive. Farmers want action and soon.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to spend some time on a problem that, sooner or later, most people will come up against. It is the problem of a few unscrupulous sellers of goods and services in this province. They are few in number, but they tarnish

the image of the countless others who do provide us with excellent goods and services. In the past year, complaints have been brought to my attention by housewives, young people, farmers and other workers. The complaints range from outright legal thievery to strong-armed persuasion and cover such things as false advertising, farm storage buildings, fly-by-night contractors and salesmen, insurance, automobiles and household equipment. And some of the cases go back for a long number of years. Now I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why should honest and hard-working people always bear the brunt? Why must they pay the price when their only mistake, if I may call it that, was that they trusted?

Mr. Speaker, I urge this Government and the Federal Government to come to grips with the situation and enact legislation with real teeth in it. Let's have legislation that will stop these unscrupulous characters. Why always fines that mean nothing, especially to the big concerns? Why not possibly consider jail sentences?

Let me add at this point, though, that in my opinion, the present Department of Consumer Affairs is doing a good job, especially when one considers that Federal legislation is what is needed for effectiveness. A good job, yes, in spite of the fact that last year Opposition Members tried to wreck the Department when they ranted and raved about the merits of allowing the Minister to protect men, women and children from dangerous articles and toys.

At any rate, I know the people of Saskatoon and area will welcome the establishment of a Consumer Affairs office in Saskatoon to receive and investigate complaints.

In the field of health and related services, I know many are thankful that chiropractic services are now insured under Medicare

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — and that a new hearing aid program will soon be implemented, one that will not cause people to give up their life savings in order to hear, as has often been the case in the past. A dental care program for children in the very near future has brought forth a tremendous response from parents all over the province and yes, even from the children, provided such service can be given during school hours.

I had the pleasure last spring, Mr. Speaker, in meeting Group Captain Cheshire, from the United Kingdom, who was in Saskatoon to turn sod for the construction of Canada's first Cheshire Home in Hanley constituency. In this regard, full credit must be given the executive and members of Cheshire Homes in Saskatoon, the Kiwanis of Saskatoon, Saskatoon City and the Provincial and Federal Governments. For those who are not aware of what purpose Cheshire Homes serve, let me tell you they are meant as lively and happy homes for our physically handicapped young. For far too long we have neglected these young people and it is my hope that this Government will make other grants available for the benefit of these young, their parents and all such people of this province.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — Mr. Speaker, many in this province are eagerly awaiting the report of the Task Force on Compensation which, hopefully, will recommend sweeping changes in this area. Why should our injured workers have to get down on their hands and knees and beg, such as was the case a few years ago? Why should a reserve fund for these workers be allowed to build up to a near astronomical figure? Is it not an indication that perhaps government in the past did not legislate well enough so that proper settlements could be achieved? I'm pleased to know that in this regard this Government did, and is taking action, which should result in better legislation in the future.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — Related to this is industrial safety which, I know, will be improved with the Occupational Health Committees which are now working with management as a team. Far too often in the past, management considered safety to be its concern, and in many cases it was, and its alone. I predict that with real worker involvement such as now can be the case, the accident rate will be lowered, worker morale will be raised and management will find the situation to be to its advantage.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — I welcome this Government's proposal to substantially reduce further the impact of property taxes for school purposes. For far too long a large number of our citizens with small incomes and some property have been paying too high a share. Truly, one can call it a Property Improvement Grant because it does create an incentive to improve, whereas without these grants, proposed improvement and ensuing higher reassessment often gave property owners second thoughts. The fact that trailer owners, businessmen and farmers are now included surely warrants the new and more fitting name for these grants. It is my hope that sometime in the near future, renters of houses may be able to be included in this grant program.

Mr. Speaker, I can only describe the Minister of Highway's (Mr. Kramer) new program to oil access roads into small communities as bold, imaginative and typically Kramerian.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — In all sincerity, I must say that this program is being accepted with vigorous enthusiasm because it is the Government's attempt in co-operation with our smaller communities, to preserve a way of life against a national trend towards urbanization.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Mostoway: — I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if these communities are allowed to 'go down the drain' and I hope they never will, we will have lost the unique cultural and racial richness which is one of the strengths of Saskatchewan.

While I'm on the topic of roads and communities, I should like to make a plea to this Government to give serious

consideration to creating a new, dust-free highway, on the so-called River Road running straight south of Saskatoon to the South Saskatchewan River Dam. Such a road would run through scenic beauty. It would make travel for sight-seers to the Dam much easier and it could serve traffic from the irrigation area to Saskatoon. But, Mr. Speaker, there's a story about this road — and it's a story about how the previous Government persuaded the rural municipalities to get busy and spend large amounts of money on this road to get it ready to be taken into the highway system. Well, they did what they were asked to do and then they waited and waited and waited. Mr. Speaker, it's pretty well established there never was any intention of honoring this promise to these municipalities and that is why I make this plea.

Mr. Speaker, permit me to touch on one more subject and this is in regard to education. As far as I'm concerned, our teachers, trustees and parent organizations are doing a good job of educating our youth. My concern, rather, is in the lack of certain instruction offered. I refer to the lack of a course which could teach them about credit-buying and its inherent dangers; about buying a house; about filling out income tax forms, and here I suggest that any student who understands these be given an "A" because he'd have to be a genius if he understood them; about contracts and magnifying glasses; about wills; and other things so that our youth would not so often as now have to pay so dearly for not knowing about these things.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I should like to commend publicly this Government for having foresight and bold imagination. I want to congratulate it for a variety of reasons. One of these is for its willingness to go out among our citizens and listen to people. I reject the Opposition's claim that this should not be done. I commend this Government for the various programs and projects it has initiated or expanded, even though Opposition Members belittle it for doing so. I commend this Government also for delighting us at the opening of this Session with the beautiful singing of the Prince Albert Girls' Choir.

Mr. Speaker, I will support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. J.G. Richards (Saskatoon University): — Mr. Speaker, there are many things in the Throne Speech I can support with pleasure. I am pleased to see that we are going to have a landlord-tenant Act. I am pleased to see that we are going finally to do something about controlling election expenses. I'm particularly pleased about the beginnings of an attempt to try to have a creative socialist policy with respect to the forest industry. The ground work was laid in the previous year by cancelling the notorious boon doggle — which the previous government had proposed with respect to the Meadow Lake pulp mill. And finally, as a point I should like to outline, Mr. Speaker, I trust the FarmStart program will have the success that it hopefully deserves. I trust that its concern with equity and the allocation of resources towards smaller farmers will do what we say in our program we hope to achieve, namely the preservation of our farm population. However, Mr. Speaker, there are certain things which I find not so good.

I do not find myself particularly enamored with the Property Improvement Grants; the transformation of 'hogs' into 'pigs' I do not find to be the most creative and ultimately the fairest way to try and lower the burden of taxation. I do not, for example, find myself particularly enamored by the idea of enlarging the Department of Industry and Commerce. I suspect that the best small business program will be the increase in employment in the Department of Industry and Commerce. I would strongly suggest that we relocate it in some struggling small town such as Kinley. But I don't want to emphasize these small questions back and forth. There are certain omissions which my wife would be very prone to point out. We have yet to have a day care program and we have yet seriously to address ourselves to women's issues.

In fact my wife is often very critical of me for my over-emphasis on economic development policy to the exclusion of what, in her mind, are the really crucial pressing issues at the moment, the crushing exploitation of women by men.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that economic development policy, despite my wife's reservations is the keynote and the theme which has been before us in the Saskatchewan political arena in the last six months and it is a theme, which despite my wife, we are going to have to address ourselves to in the following six months.

As for the general economy, Mr. Speaker, obviously there is some good news this year, in particular the increased farm income. However, that is obviously a very unstable prosperity and nobody is very confident of its preservation in the future. Unfortunately we still do have declining populations in Saskatchewan, be it a declining rate of decline. The decline from 1969 to 1970 was 17,000, that between 1970 and 1971 15,000, and that between 1971 and 1972 was 12,000. From a peak population of 962,000 in October of 1968 we now have a population according to the latest estimates from Statistics Canada of 912,000 in October 1972.

There is stagnation in mineral production. It is marginally down this year. Potash production is down in value from \$146 to \$143 millions, and very marginally oil production is down from \$219 to \$211 millions in value.

We have economic problems, and everybody I trust, on both sides of the House, is willing to recognize them. I would submit as I argued in the previous speech which I made a year ago before you, that the basic problem is a lack of provincial power over our economy.

There are no master plans, there are no sure-fire absolute ultimate solutions as to how we are to regain this kind of control. I would submit what is needed are a number of significant attempts and significant attacks on the key industrial sectors to wrest them from corporate control and bring them under public control. To that extent this is the way that we should view the progress in the forest industry and to come to something very specific again, that is what I think we should do with the oil industry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may recall that I dealt last year with the oil industry in my contribution to the Throne Speech Debate. Perhaps you would have preferred that I touch on

something altogether different and new. But as Mr. Furlong, the head of the Canadian Petroleum Association said recently, "This is going to be the year of the great debate with respect to energy resources." Given that blessing by Mr. Furlong I should like to make my contribution to this Debate and I should like, in particular, to tackle the question of public ownership of the provincial oil industry.

Let us begin with some concern and some analysis of the whole question of the price increases which have been announced by the industry. I should like to go back to an article in the Globe and Mail which appeared on the 27th of June: "Gas firms seek 10-cent price increase." Here is an article about representations made by the Alberta gas industry as to how it absolutely had to double the price of natural gas. Sure enough not much later is an article dated 26th of August, 1972: "Alberta Energy Board finds field price for gas too low."

The field price of Alberta natural gas is 10 to 20 cents a thousand cubic feet below its true value.

By some strange philosophical process they have managed in the Alberta Energy Board to discover what is the "true" value for gas.

I strongly suspect the true value for gas happens to be what the Alberta oil and gas industry whispers in the ear of the Alberta Energy Board. Nonetheless we soon had after that, a two-price system being announced by the Premier of Alberta and in this two-price system we had a doubling of the price of natural gas precisely as the industry required which resulted in \$200 million in increased revenues from the public going into the pockets of the multi-national oil and gas corporations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have talked about gas price increases — oil is certainly not far behind. We go back to February 1972 and we have an article again in the Globe and Mail:

A round of petroleum product price increases is expected to begin during the next few months.

And the Globe and Mail was certainly not off the mark. I quote now from Oil Week which is a trade magazine of the oil and gas industry coming out of Calgary. In January 15, 1973 — title of the article, "Imperial boosts its crude oil price by 20 cents." To show what sterling competition there is in the oil and gas industry, Gulf and Shell immediately followed suit with identical price increases of 20 cents per barrel. How much does that mean, Mr. Speaker, for the oil and gas industry? That means an additional \$67 million according to Oil Week, and why? Why do we have to have, not only the gas price increase but the oil price increase?

I should like to introduce a Mr. Twaits to you gentlemen. Mr. Twaits is Chairman of the Board, chief executive officer of Imperial Oil Limited which is 70 per cent owned by Standard Oil of New Jersey. Mr. Twaits will figure prominently in our discussions as we proceed, therefore, I want to give him his due introduction.

Since Imperial Oil is undeniably the price leader in the oil and gas industry it very often falls to this learned gentleman to put forward the industry opinion to justify whatever price manipulation they currently happen to be engaged in. Now

February 1, 1973

according to Mr. Twaits, producers have experienced increased exploration and production costs and this year they face higher taxes. According to Mr. Twaits these price increases are justified by increased costs and increased provincial taxation in Alberta.

Now, we might also not forget, we have already talked about gas price increases, we have talked about increases in crude oil, and of course we must not leave out the refined product. In the 10th of January issue of the Globe and Mail an appropriate large headline, "Imperial oil raises national price list by up to two cents." Two cents per gallon that is, Mr. Speaker. Two cents per gallon implies approximately 60 cents per barrel, which means approximately two times the price increase of the crude.

Mr. Twaits at this juncture justified the increase in retail prices by the previous price increase in the crude prices. He failed to mention that he was increasing the retail price by twice the increase of the crude price. Nonetheless here is where the situation stands. Are these increases justified on the basis of cost as Mr. Twaits has argued?

I should like to proceed now to try and answer that question. One argument that Mr. Twaits put forward was that this was all due to the increased taxation being exacted by the Alberta Government. To refer to an editorial in the Globe and Mail, "The Alberta people will only get through their Government one-sixth of the price increase." Maybe they are slightly conservative in their estimates, maybe as much as one-third of the increase is going to the people of Alberta via increased taxation. The remainder of these huge increases amounting to hundreds of millions of dollars are going to corporate profits, Mr. Speaker.

An innocuous little article appeared on the 26th of January, only about one column inch long, but again it is an interesting article:

Imperial Oil earnings up. Profits of Imperial Oil were \$151 million last year compared with \$136 million in 1971.

It is hardly a situation in which increased costs warranted increases in prices.

Mr. Speaker, there is another excruciatingly delightful passage which I should like to read to you. Again, it comes from Mr. Twaits' 1971 Annual Report of Imperial Oil, and it really has to be read and relished to understand the wordage of annual reports and the way in which the oil industry communicates with the people of Canada:

Firmer product prices and increased operating efficiency resulted in improved realization from sales of petroleum products.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we shall proceed to translate that bit of public relation nonsense into what it really means. Firmer product prices means higher prices. Increased operating efficiency, costs didn't go up, improved realization from sales means that profit did go up. That is precisely what the report proceeds to show. It does take a little bit of deciphering, Mr. Speaker, because Mr. Twaits is not prone to use the Queen's

English in its pristine simplicity when discussing corporate profits.

The most knowledgeable people presumably about the national energy industry would be the Federal Department of Energy, Mines and Resources. I should like to quote from the Federal colleagues of the Members opposite, from Mr. Donald MacDonald. This is an article which appeared the end of January in the Saskatoon Star-Phoenix and Mr. MacDonald proceeded to explain the price “increases. “Oil price increases explained, says Mr. MacDonald.”

Energy Minister Donald S. MacDonald said Wednesday that gas and oil price increases announced by some major oil companies reflect more costly refining operations in Western Canada and higher imported crude oil prices in Eastern Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we shall return to the question of the cost. But we now have another variable to explain it. It is all due to the increase in the price of crude from elsewhere. Somebody else is increasing the price somewhere else therefore how can we stay behind and leave the price lower here. If Joe across the sea can increase his price, why shouldn't we be able to increase our domestic price? Does Mr. MacDonald seriously believe that Canadian people will accept that kind of gibberish as a national energy policy, and his justification for these exorbitant price demands, price increases exacted from the Canadian people?

I think as a final definitive kind of assessment of where the Canadian oil industry is at with respect to problems of increased costs, I will again refer to the Trade Journal of the industry coming out of Calgary, which is hardly a Waffle organ and their figures, Mr. Speaker, are as follows.

In 1971 the Western Canadian oil and gas industry, according to Oil Week, had profits of \$296 million. In 1972 they estimate the profit of the industry to be — and all of these estimates are before the recent price increases came into effect — they estimate that the profits in 1972 in the oil and gas industry in Western Canada at \$507 million. There is a two-thirds increase in profits of the industry in one year and Mr. Twaits is chattering on about increased cost in taxes justifying price increases.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has referred on numerous occasions to figures of \$100 million profit earned by the oil and gas industry in Saskatchewan from its crude operation. I think these are reasonable figures. Approximately \$1 per barrel is profit before the 30-cent per barrel increase by the oil industry from every barrel that is extracted from Saskatchewan. Approximately 90 million barrels are extracted from Saskatchewan annually.

Another and final way to look at the problem and realize the profitability of the industry is to go to the question of breaking down the costs of a gallon of gasoline. Again, before the recent price increases of 2 cents a gallon, the total cost which could be identified by the Alberta Government survey of marketing as cost per gallon of gasoline, substituting the Saskatchewan for the Alberta road tax, is 39 cents. That leaves a profit per gallon of 14 cents, if you assume the regular retail price of 53 cents is prevailing before the current announced price increase.

Mr. Speaker, we are fast approaching 1984. We have

Mr. Nixon, who was elected as a man of peace, and one month later he is wreaking the most deadly bombing on Viet Nam, the most deadly bombing perhaps that has ever been known by any people at any time. Again, we are hopefully at a cease fire. But there is a time in which we have double talk and double thinking by our public leaders. And surely Mr. Twaits is an ideal candidate as we approach 1984 to assume the role of 'big brother', to assume the role of the leader in this misinformation, a misinforming role which the oil industry perpetrates on the people of Canada.

I might recall, for example, his comments at the time of the announced closure of the Imperial Oil Refinery in Regina. Environmental protection was the basic factor in the company's decision to build a new supply system and to concentrate refining facilities in Edmonton. Environmental protection: That is a glorious trick of propaganda. The people of Regina are expected to blame the environmental movement for the loss of their refinery. It had nothing, of course, to do with environmental protection. The refineries were old, the refineries were obsolete, they needed to be replaced and the industry, completely oblivious of the needs of development in Saskatchewan, decided that it would concentrate all its processing of oil, the refining stage in Edmonton.

As the Premier pointed out in his recent speech to the Canadian Petroleum Association it meant a loss of 350 to 400 jobs directly. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had some discussion here about the problems of the industry and I trust I have demonstrated to your satisfaction that the industry is earning exorbitant profits at the people's expense. But we have had all of this question of price increase clouded over with the crisis of energy, the energy crisis which we have all been living under for the last month. We have had pictures on the television of people huddled in their offices with parkas because of the lack of fuel.

Now, admittedly in the long run, there is a very serious energy crisis as the industrial world continues to use its resources at a staggering rate. But in the short run any energy crisis has surely been manufactured by the industry in order to be a diversion and a bludgeon, to divert public attention away from its recent price increases and manipulations and a bludgeon to force the Canadian Government to accept a continental energy policy that will result in unlimited access of the United States to Canadian energy.

Senator Jackson just coincidentally conducted his hearings of his sub-committee on a continental energy policy at the time of all these people hovering around their offices in their parkas. Here are some elementary figures and analysis of our Canadian energy situation, not immediately serious but in the long run requiring serious consideration. In 1960 Canada's natural reserves were good for 53 years at then current rates of production. In 1971 there remained reserves for 28 years. Oil in Canada will last approximately 18 years, given present production rates.

A very interesting piece of analysis in the book "Limits to Growth" estimates that the world shall have no more oil left within 50 years. Maybe the books underlying this assumption are totally wrong, however, they seem fairly realistic. It assumes that we are going to have the same annual increase of four per cent in world demand that we have experienced in the past, there

exists five times the present known reserves of 455 billion barrels of oil.

What are the Federal Liberals doing? I refer back to a recent article in the Star Phoenix entitled, "Ottawa holds secret talks with United States," with a view to creating a continental oil policy. Given the continental politics of the federal equivalents of the Members opposite, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely necessary that we in Saskatchewan take the lead in ending this irrational, crazy policy of energy utilization.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Richards: — There are three approaches to do it. The first, I would label the colonial approach, or perhaps the Davey Steuart approach, we will honor it with his name. The Davey Steuart approach, and I read from a newspaper:

Surely the Government's approach to the Imperial Oil affair (this was the announced closure of the refinery) should be to sit down with the company and like reasonable men negotiate terms whereby Imperial Oil will stay in Regina and guarantee the employment of the 160 men employed.

This is the colonial mentality, Mr. Speaker, it is the assumption that we have no power to wield and the best that we can do, is on our best behavior to approach the industry, to sit down with the noble Mr. Twaits and to politely ask him whether he would reconsider his \$150 million investment in Edmonton because we would kind of like to keep these 160 jobs in Regina. Now I don't think that approach deserves a great deal further consideration.

The second approach consists of a whole series of reforms which are imposed upon the industry. I think this is basically the direction which our Government has taken today. I would hasten to add I do not think it is the ideal solution.

What we are doing with the Government oil exploration can be interpreted as one minor reform by inserting the public risk of capital into the exploration area, thereby solving one of the particular problems which the Premier noted, namely, the fact that we do not have a consistent, thorough exploration activity currently being undertaken.

There are many more things which we could do. We could have a Bill of Rights for service station operators. Presently the service station operator is some kind of feudal serf. Not for nothing is Canada's branch of Standard Oil called Imperial, the only country in the world where Standard Oil can come in and call its branch plant Imperial and not have an immediate revolt from the local population.

But the situation has got so bad that the Alberta Automobile Retailers group is submitting briefs to the Alberta Government which are critical of the major refineries. The annual rate of turnover of these people is 25 per cent, four years on an average. Each time they turn over, \$3,000 to \$5,000 of a man's personal savings are gobbled up in a lost investment in trying to stand on a par with the oil industry.

Another obvious specific reform is drastically to increase the royalties. And a final one which should be noted, is that Premier Barrett, yesterday, announced his plans for an Industry Price Review Board, which would control and limit any future manipulations by Mr. Twaits and his friends of oil prices.

All of these, Mr. Speaker, are good in themselves and are worthy of support, but, the industry has a tremendous ability, given its power to deflect regulations and particular reforms. If we increase the royalties they may very well merely engage in a further increase of prices along the line, such that you have in no way deflected, really, any profits away from the oil industry. You have merely imposed another kind of tax on the people by increasing the price of oil.

Given the power of the oil industry it is capable of doing such things. Further, by approaching the problem with a series of piecemeal reforms we are in danger merely of fitting ourselves into nooks and crannies of the present system without really seriously changing it. If we do a bit of exploration where they are not doing it, and so there is great danger that the Provincial Oil Exploration company, which has been proposed, would merely amount to a provincial equivalent of Pan Arctic Oil, the Federal Liberal partnership with the oil industry in exploration in the Northwest Territories.

I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that really what has to be done is complete public ownership of the industry. At this point I should like to quote an extended passage from a very illuminating address by David Cass-Beggs at a seminar in the North American Energy Conference in Calgary, March 1972.

Mr. Steuart: — Where are the socialists over there John, they aren't applauding

Mr. Richards: — With serious consideration, Hon. Leader of the Opposition, the people on this side of the House are thinking, unlike the quick lipped, insensitive

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Richards: Members opposite who spend their time looking for the quick wisecrack.

To return to Mr. David Cass-Beggs. I should like to close by raising what I know will seem to be the most controversial issue of the paper, namely the advisability of further extension of government or public ownership in the energy industry. It is logical to suppose as the need arises the concept of public ownership should be extended into the other aspects of the energy industry which will apply to the major gas systems, the major pipelines and the major oil, gas, coal and nuclear reserves. I suggest the only open question is when will the need arise? Perhaps the answer is

Mr. Steuart: — Who said that?

Mr. Richards: — Listen Davey at such times as the pressure to establish and conform to a national energy plan that will meet

the needs of the environment and solve the problems of achieving energy balance exceeds the ability of the industry in its several parts to co-operate, to plan and to conform without the imposition of intolerable controls. The time scale may extend over a few decades or it may be much shorter than one thinks. Public concern is increasing at an astonishing rate, governments will be forced to achieve by one means or another a planned energy use in conformity with environmental demands. The simple solution will be the integration of the industry under unified public control and an instruction to the industry to work out its destiny within certain basic terms of reference. The hard way will be to persuade the segmented industry and its foreign owners to accept an overall plan that is in the public interest and survive under a complexity of controls such as those which are developing today in the United States.

I am not raising this issue from any doctrinaire ideological approach but from experience of the practical situation, the observation of current developments. The trends that one sees today do not allay the theory that industry-based plans will not be for the benefit of the consuming public. Among the alarming aspects are the facts that the oil and gas industry is largely controlled outside Canada, that the control is centred in a few multi-national companies which have a history of political coercion, that these companies are extending their operations into other energy fields such as coal, not to facilitate planning in the interests of the public but to eliminate competition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has expressed himself speaking to a meeting of the Canadian Petroleum Association which for reasons which are perhaps obvious, I quote:

The Government of Saskatchewan is not attracted at this time to any complete public ownership of the oil industry in Saskatchewan.

I beg to differ. I think Mr. David Cass-Beggs has expressed the case well, I think we have got to start looking at what are the nuts and bolts of running Sask-Oil as an integrated publicly owned oil company, integrated from the exploration activity to the crude, to the refining, to retail distribution. That is the minimum that is required in order to solve the problem of exorbitant profitability, of lost Saskatchewan jobs, and the failure of the foreign controlled oil industry to pursue ecologically wise policies.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Richards: — “At the exploration level we need a thorough exploration of the pre-Mississippian southern Saskatchewan deposits.” I am quoting from Simpson Exploration Company in Calgary. “In southern Saskatchewan there are more than 35,000 cubic miles of pre-Mississippian sediment. World-wide results indicate that statistically such a volume should range between 875 million to 1.7 billion barrels of oil.” There is oil to be discovered in Saskatchewan. It is not a case that the risk involved in a large scale oil exploration activity is such that we cannot envisage some action promised by the Provincial Government. To quote the figures for 1972, two out of five explorations wells were not dry, they did yield either oil or gas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in respect to leases we are going to

have to repatriate them, we are going to have to use some precedents which we hopefully established in undoing the evil work perpetrated by the Liberals in the forest industry. The precedents which we took here in the forest industry in regaining public control of forest leases we are going to have to be prepared to follow with respect to oil.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Richards: — Many countries think that the problem of how to get control of oil that has been alienated by previous colonial administrations is to introduce, as a valid legal concept, excess profitability. Chile is doing it, the United Nations Committee for Trade and Development has approved at its recent Geneva convention in the fall of 1972 that excess profits is a perfectly valid legal concept to use in arriving at what is appropriate compensation, if any, to repatriating the leases that have been granted to private oil companies. I trust that the experiences which have been learned elsewhere in the world we will be prepared to apply when we come to repatriating leases.

With respect to refining we are going to have to construct, hopefully in conjunction with the Co-op refinery, within the next five or six years a medium large oil refinery of the order of 75,000 to 80,000 barrels per day. Now according to reports of Clinical Engineering that is in the range of the lowest unit-cost for refineries. According to their data refinery costs do not significantly lower as you go from the 70,000 range up to the currently mentioned ranges of 140,000 barrels which Imperial, for example, is using in Edmonton. We are not making any sacrifices of efficiency if we have 70,000 barrels per day within Saskatchewan. However, in order to justify the market for a refinery of 70,000 barrels per day capacity, we are going to need to have in conjunction with the Co-op a virtual monopoly of retail gasoline and retail oil product sales. It is at the retail level perhaps, Mr. Speaker, that the economic problems are the worst and it has got the most irrational system of marketing oil that corporate capitalism could possibly imagine. They talk about the inefficiencies of public enterprise, Mr. Speaker, but if they would look at the irrationality of Spanish cookware and gold coins and free car washes and bumper stickers and the rest of the “gimmicks” that goes on in the retail distribution of gasoline, I think they should hang their heads in shame when they talk about efficiency in private enterprise.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Richards: — Again to refer back to the Alberta Government survey, there is at least 100 per cent overcapacity in the retail end of the oil industry, 100 per cent overcapacity which you and I as consumers of oil products are paying for.

I think what we are going to have to do here, Mr. Speaker, is that we are going to have to be prepared to expropriate all retail assets, (and there is a constitutional legal problem posed) of the oil industry in Saskatchewan. We are talking in the order of 2,500 service stations and \$200 million worth of assets at book value. But again it should be understood that given the profitability of the industry we can pay the compensation out of the operating revenue. A simple formula, I don't

know if it is necessary or most desirable, is for the Government merely to continue the lease rental arrangement which is two cents per gallon which the private lessee operators now pay. There is not a problem in terms of finding the financial resources to take these over, the real problems, Mr. Speaker, are going to be in the questions of the politics and legality doing what was needed. I would argue that legally we can do what is needed, there are sufficient precedents in potash, rests, oil that we can control this resource under provincial jurisdiction.

I think economically the situation is crystal clear, there are exorbitant profits in the industry. We could scarcely run it more inefficiently than the private oil companies are now doing.

Now politically, there is going to be a tremendous struggle involved in exerting and gaining public control of the oil industry. Maybe we had better pay a little bit of homage to previous struggles of Saskatchewan people against the oil industry. To go back to the 1920s there were a large number of small retail co-ops which saved considerable amounts to the farmer customers in bulk fuel purchases. Of course, the private oil industry didn't like that, these small retail co-ops were purchasing from independent refineries and the majors bought up the independent refineries. Then the majors began increasing the prices, the wholesale prices of refined products. After one particular obnoxious price increase of three cents a gallon the farmers got themselves together and said, enough is enough. It is time for us to have a co-operatively owned refinery. In the winter of 1933-34 they made this decision and in the summer of 1934 they went around to the people of Saskatchewan and in the middle of the depression they gathered funds in order to begin and to finance the Co-operative Refinery. Those were hard times, Mr. Speaker. They managed during the course of that summer to raise \$32,000. In the autumn of 1934 they gathered again, and they said, we have only \$32,000, is that enough to get into this industry, should we risk the \$32,000 of farmers' money which is hard-won money in times of poverty? They decided yes, they decided to go ahead. In May of 1935 the Co-op Refinery first came on stream. In that year of 1935 alone, there were sales of \$235,000 and a surplus to the customers of the Co-op of \$30,000. Down through the years despite opposition from the private oil industry the Co-op Refinery has been one of the most profitable arenas of co-op activity in the province. Interestingly, a footnote here, the Co-op Refinery at 22,000 barrels per day is the only sizeable Canadian owned refinery in the country.

Maybe we have something to learn from what our forefathers did in the 1930s in establishing the Co-op Refinery. Maybe the recently announced price increases by Mr. Twaits, of fiddling around with 20 cents per barrel there and two cents per gallon here, increased gas prices and this kind of funny rhetoric in his annual report, maybe Mr. Twaits has just once too often tried to reorganize the Imperial empire. Maybe the time has come that we in Saskatchewan can again take the lead in the significant area of social progress. We in Saskatchewan despite the continentalistic Liberal politicians in Ottawa and across the House, maybe now is the time that we can have a publicly owned industry in Saskatchewan, as with Medicare and as with so many other reforms, Mr. Speaker. Once again the Saskatchewan people can show the lead to the rest of Canada in establishing

sound rational socialist policies for the 1970s.

I will support the motion, Mr. Speaker.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. K.R. MacLeod (Regina Albert Park): — Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate those Members who have received promotions and appointments since the last meeting of this House. In particular I should like to congratulate the Hon. Member for Yorkton (Mr. Carlson), but I do suggest that the farmers might be a little better off if the roles of the two were reversed, that he became the Minister of Agriculture and the Member for Tisdale-Kelsey (Mr. Messer) were his Cabinet Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech has several serious shortcomings. There are today some growing clouds of doubt on the future of the Regina Campus. Many thoughtful people are growing increasingly concerned about its long-term prospects. I had hoped that the Throne Speech might have contained a clear and concise declaration of intention respecting the Campus; much to our regret it did not. The Government failed to outline its intentions with respect to the University of Saskatchewan and particularly Regina Campus. Mr. Speaker, the creation at Regina of the Regina Campus as a separate university is an immediate necessity. Southern Saskatchewan needs a university, but it must have separate status and its future must be secured. This does not mean that Regina must duplicate everything which is in Saskatoon. Saskatoon will continue and must continue as the major university in this province. Regina must have a suitable institution for education at the university level. If we do not thousands of young people in southern Saskatchewan will be denied the opportunity for higher education. The children of working people will be hit the hardest.

The situation with Regina Campus is rapidly becoming intolerable. Each week the uncertainties and instability on this campus grow, while the Government remains silent. The representatives appointed by the Government to the board of governors appear unacceptably tame, apparently taking their instruction from the Premier. All the while the Premier pretends that the university has autonomy, and is free from political interference. This hidden hand leadership is all too common with this Government. Committee findings are apparently directed from the office of the Premier. For example, the recommendations of the agriculture committee are apparently on the Premier's desk. I can assure the Members of this House that they are not on my desk nor have they been on the desks of my fellow Members of the Opposition who formed part of that committee.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — All the while the Premier keeps his hand hidden. He awaits public reaction before taking a firm stand on principle. It is the same with other Ministers.

Last year the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) himself, was pleased to announce loudly and frequently (although not entirely accurately) that there would be no increase in auto insurance rates. This year there will be an increase. The Attorney

General went into hiding, and one of his officials was designated as the person who must make the unfortunate announcement. But the silence of the Attorney General is like thunder when compared to the silence of the Premier, the Minister of Continuing Education (Mr. MacMurchy) and the Throne Speech on the question of the Regina Campus and university education in Saskatchewan.

I am concerned about the general lack of a clear policy in the Government and in the Throne Speech with regard to the university. Government interference in the university has long been a cause of friction both in the House and upon the campus, and I do not wish to encourage it. But the basic organization of the university, the decision as to whether there is to be an independent campus serving the southern part of the province, is a political one, one in which this Government is failing to show the kind of leadership the public has a right to expect.

We don't want or need an exact duplication of the Saskatoon Campus here in Regina. Neither academic excellence nor considerations of economy would be served by it. But we have a right to have a university which, within its scope, is an autonomous institution with traditions and allegiances of its own. We have a right to a university which will not suffer from the branch plan insecurities which plague so many businesses in our province.

The Government must assume responsibility for rationalizing the development of these two universities. It must give some leadership, this hidden-hand leadership is not fair to the people. They have the right to know where the Government stands and where it is going.

Supporters and opponents alike knew where the Liberal Government was going. You may not have agreed with the late Premier, but his position was clear. There was some leadership

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — there was leadership and you knew where you stood.

A university is not an industry to be attracted for the sake only of the money it produces. It is not a prize of the Department of Industry and Commerce. The university belongs to the people. The university, its conduct and its spending, should be open to inspection by the people who pay for it. I deplore the fortress attitude of many senior university officials. The 'university-as-an-industry' approach, the fortress attitude and lack of government leadership are the prime cause of our present turmoil.

Citizens of Regina and Saskatoon and the rest of the province would welcome a forthright, sensible approach by this Government. It would be a disaster if this important matter descended into a narrow, petty contest between two cities. The cause of education and of our young people would suffer serious harm. I, therefore, call upon the Government to make its intentions known. I ask the Premier to say now, without the appointment of any further committees, what the Government

proposes to do. With respect to education then, the Throne Speech is devoid of any worthwhile material.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to comment briefly on the remarks made by the Hon. Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards). He makes some accurate points, his statistics are fairly accurate. He shows that there is a shortage of fossil fuels and he correctly and accurately expresses concern for the future. His argument proves the value of these fuels, he proves the value of conservation, he proves the value of taking good care of our reserves, he proves the value of a national policy.

His argument is seriously impaired, however, by his obvious political bias. You cannot say that this fuel is immensely valuable and then say on the other hand that there is no justification for price increases. His suggestions that costs do not justify increases are totally unrealistic and inaccurate. He knows very well that costs in every area have increased in the past five and ten years. Companies with which we have any connection at all are paying twice the cost today to drill wells at the same depth that were drilled five and six years ago. What is this whispering that he talks about by the companies into the ear of the Alberta Conservation Board. There needs to be no whispering, the Government of Alberta, a Progressive Conservative Government, which runs a deficit from \$150 million to \$200 million per year doesn't need to worry about the oil companies talking to it, it wants more money out of the oil industry. It is most anxious that these prices be increased and that is the reason for the visit of Premier Davis of Ontario to the Premier of Alberta. It was much to the concern of the Premier of Ontario that a Progressive Conservative Premier got elected in Alberta, one who wants more money out of natural gas. The result of a Progressive Conservative Government in Ontario coupled with a Progressive Conservative Government in Ottawa would be a large increase in the price paid by consumers in Ontario, particularly as long as it is influenced heavily by a government under the Progressive Conservatives in Alberta.

I am concerned with the loss and the mismanagement of some of our companies, but most of the companies are very careful. Most of our conservation boards are very careful to make sure that there is no wastage in the oil industry. But there is no profit in telling us that we should spend \$25 million in buying up service stations unless somebody can demonstrate to me that this will save us some fuel. What is the purpose in the Government of Saskatchewan spending \$25 million to buy service outlets, retail outlets when the real problem is not the retail outlet at all.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacLeod: — The problem is in safe and reasonable management of our resources. The problem with the Members of the New Democratic Party and the real problem with the Member for Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) is that he mixes his facts, he mixes his real concern for the future and the protection of our natural resources with his narrow political bias.

I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that jealousy over profits is no justification for this policy. He wants to repatriate the leases, what he is really suggesting is confiscation. I

wonder when he is talking about repatriation of leases if he intends to take leases from the farmer, if the farmer who owns his own oil rights is going to lose it to this Government that is clearly part of the program advocated by the Member for Saskatoon University. I can tell the Hon. Member from Saskatoon University what he would define as excess profitability. Excess profitability will be that price you pay to the Arab countries or oil and gas when we run out of our products. I can assure him that nothing in anything that he has said has done anything to conserve our product. The only way we will save our natural gas and our gasoline is if we, the people, the ordinary citizens, decide that we are not going to use as much as we have in the past. Now you can play games all you like, you can decide that instead of Imperial Oil owning it, it is going to be owned by the Government. You can decide that instead of having a retail outlet opened by Shell, or Gulf or the Co-op, it is going to be owned by the Government, but until you stop pumping quite as much gas through those pumps you are not going to do anything at all about the conservation of our resources. We, the people, have got to accept the fact that we are using up our resources tremendous rates. We, the people, have got to educate ourselves, we must convince ourselves that we must tighten our belts when it comes to using these natural resources. Consequently, Mr. Speaker, this argument about ownership, this argument about repatriating the leases, seizing the leases, getting government ownership, buying up all of these retail outlets, is pure hogwash. Mr. Speaker, until, we, the ordinary citizens, decide that we cannot use these as fast as we have in the past we will not make any headway at all in the preservation of our natural resources.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying, therefore, that this program, the Throne Speech, does not outline any serious or sensible program to preserve our natural resources. It does not solve one of the main problems which I have spoken about today, namely the University of Saskatchewan, the situation as it is in southern Saskatchewan or for that matter in Saskatoon. It is a document designed more to conceal than to reveal, consequently I have no choice but to vote against the motion. However, Mr. Speaker, I have listened very carefully to the remarks of the Hon. Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac). His well-reasoned and carefully enunciated principles have convinced me, have persuaded me that I have no choice but to support the amendment, and I so declare.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.W. Cody (Watrous): — Mr. Speaker, I want first of all to take the opportunity to join my colleagues who have spoken before me and to congratulate the mover and seconder pointing out some of the highlights to this House that the people of Saskatchewan will enjoy from this Throne Speech. I also wish to congratulate the three new ministers who have been appointed to the Cabinet since we last met. They have already shown their capabilities in their various departments under their jurisdiction. I think it would be also fair that one should congratulate the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy). I don't know why one would want to congratulate an individual like this because the conduct that he showed this afternoon and the disregard he showed for this Assembly when he wouldn't so much as sit down when Mr. Speaker brought him to order.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, I have only been in this House for a very short period of time but I have been in the gallery many times and on many occasions, but I have never witnessed such a sick looking Opposition in my life. They aren't only sick looking in their benches, they are also sick looking in the corridors.

Mr. Lane: — You should have been here two years ago.

Mr. Cody: — Some of them maybe would like to purchase a pill or two or a drug or two — we could probably get some of those if they needed them.

Mr. Lane: — At Bruno?

Mr. Cody: — I don't think it's a necessity for me to speak on the issue at Bruno. The Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) has done a pretty good job on that in the Humboldt Journal. He got all of an inch of ink and that's about all he had to say about it.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be on this side of the House and pleased to see that the economy in this province has finally gone on the upswing. As my colleague from Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) has already mentioned retail sales are up, job situations are increasing, unemployment is on the decline, and we have substantially curbed the population exodus.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) would have us believe the upswing in the economy is due to the efforts of Otto Lang. Well, I can tell this ill-informed Member that the people of my constituency are still suffering the remnants of Operation LIFT and Otto Lang. We could very easily, Mr. Speaker, use some of the grain which we were asked not to grow. I will be the first to say that grain sales are at an all time high but certainly not because of Operation LIFT or Otto Lang, but rather because of the crop failure in Russia and some other countries across the pond.

Mr. Speaker, the hog industry and the cattle sales have also contributed in part to the upswing in our economy. I am sure the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) can't say that the Hon. Otto Lang is responsible for that too. However, let me be the first to warn the farmers of this province that they should be working closely with this Government to ensure a stable support price with a guaranteed minimum. I would suggest they get busy and stand up and be counted and yell loud because that Liberal opposition and the Liberal Party in this province are out to destroy any program this Government is bound to bring in just to see that the farmer doesn't make an extra dollar.

The Hon. Member from Prince Albert West was trying to throw cold water on the Hog Marketing Commission Monday when he spoke in this House. I say to the farmers of this province, don't let him get away with it, you've got to get out and fight. The Leader of the Opposition and his cohorts across the way will go so far as to organize in the country to beat the farmers out of the very thing their own organizations such as the Wheat Pool,

the Saskatchewan Federation of Agriculture, and the National Farmers' Union have been asking for years. If you don't believe this, if you don't believe what I'm saying, let me read a quote from a newsletter from Mr. E.A. Boden, Vice President of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool and President of the Federation of Agriculture and I quote:

It's about time Saskatchewan hog producers both commercial and otherwise woke up and did something effective in the marketing field.

Boden went on to say and I quote:

We are getting somewhat tired of the very obvious political manoeuvring and at obstructing the creating of a more rational marketing system. I want the actual producers in this province to know we recognize the real motives of certain groups who want to scuttle the plan.

I am not sure if these certain groups he was talking about may been the Palliser Wheat Growers and it may have been the Liberal Party and it could have been the Tory Party. One can speculate on this point.

An Hon. Member: — Liberal Party.

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, I think the story is well told in this and we know who these certain groups are within the sector.

An Hon. Member: — They're right over there.

Mr. Cody: — Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see this Government continue to take new steps toward stabilizing prices and marketing by way of strengthening the Hog Marketing Board before introducing a low cost credit program with earned grants. With this new program we shall see the livestock industry in this province flourish as it never has before. Unlike, Mr. Member from Prince Albert West, the dilemma we saw three years ago under your government.

Mr. Michayluk — 20 cent hogs.

Mr. Cody: — Exactly as the Member from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) said — 20 cent hogs. They allowed the hog industry to deteriorate to its lowest level that the history of this province has ever seen and that is deplorable in the eyes of the farmers. These same Members that are sitting over there, in 1975 I am sure, the farmers will see are still sitting there.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge this Opposition today to rise above their bias for a change and to vote in favor of strengthening this Hog Marketing Commission. But I predict they will do the same thing as Liberals and Conservatives did in the past 100 years and they will vote against it. Mr. Speaker, you can recall and I am sure all the Members on this side of the House can, the way the old line parties worked against the Canadian Wheat Board, the way they worked against the Wheat Pool

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order:

Mr. Cody: — against automobile insurance, and more recently the way they worked against Medicare. I say to this Opposition today, a vote against the Hog Marketing Commission is a vote against orderly marketing. They are just the kind of people that will vote against it.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to see that the Throne Speech called for amendments to The Agricultural Implement Act which seeks to give farmers who have the complaints concerning the availability of parts some recourse. I do not want this legislation to be construed as an attack on the machinery dealers because this is simply not the case. Any machine dealers whom I have spoken to in the past several weeks and the past several months

Mr. Steuart: — Have you spoken to Percy Schmeiser?

Mr. Cody: — I've spoken to him in more ways than one. It hasn't been about machinery, you can believe that. But these machinery dealers which I have spoken to are willing to carry any amount of parts which are required for the farmers' needs. However, they cannot afford to stock large amounts of parts. Why? Because the expense is too high and rigid financing arrangements are placed on them by the machine companies. Mr. Speaker, I lay the blame for this acute situation in the country squarely on the shoulders of the machine companies and not on the shoulders of the dealers. If not, Mr. Speaker, by legislation, I hope by desire the machine companies will come out and give their dealers a better chance to enable them to carry adequate stocks so that they can give proper service to farmers.

Machine companies, Mr. Speaker, like the railways are not interested in service to the public but rather are interested in making big profits like the Liberal Party. They would rather sell machinery to a few dealers or outlets in this province. I know people, Mr. Speaker, in the constituency of the Hon. Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac), farmers who had to drive clear from Wilkie to Regina for parts last fall for their combines. If these machine companies had seen fit to keep a depot with repair parts in Saskatoon they could have ordered the parts from Biggar and saved this man a 500 mile round trip.

What did the Member from Wilkie do? He didn't do a thing. He was consulted, he was told about it, but he didn't do a thing. He moved to Battleford.

Mr. Speaker, in the areas of resource development, I feel this Government is going in the proper direction which will best benefit the citizens of this province. The people in this province own the natural resources and therefore should develop them for their own benefit rather than for the benefit of people who were attracted to this province by the Liberal Party. I am proud to see that we will be expanding the role of the publicly owned Saskatchewan Forests Products Corporation. It is long overdue that we get a firm grip on our forest products particularly in the area of utilization. Harvesting and reforestation practices have generally improved. However, they still require more improvement.

The Premier indicated in his speech on Wednesday that

clear cutting had been halted. However, I warn this Government that close scrutiny must be placed on the practices of the Prince Albert Pulp Mill. My suggestion is that this timber-hungry operation brought in by the Hon. Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) must stay in line and if they don't they should be put out of business.

I had the occasion last week to speak to a friend of the Member from Cumberland (Mr. Feschuk), who is a trapper and he was telling me the conditions in the North around the lakes and areas where pulp is being cut are still in a mess. Mr. Speaker, I don't think this Government will go along with this kind of situation should they get out of hand.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech contained another first for this province, that being the establishment of a Crown corporation relating to oil and gas exploration. I would hope in this connection we could work closely with the Co-op Refinery and Federated Co-operatives in joint efforts of exploration of oil and gas. Mr. Speaker, with attitudes like Imperial Oil and Gulf which was more eloquently explained this afternoon by the Member from University (Mr. Richards), this Government has no alternative but to accept its responsibility and push on with a new, bold and imaginative program for exploration of oil and gas. Imperial Oil is obviously not interested in Saskatchewan or it would not be closing its refining plant here. Gulf has already closed its facilities in Saskatoon and Moose Jaw. One can only think they have lost interest in Saskatchewan or they couldn't care less about the citizens of this province. Mr. Speaker, these companies have sucked us dry and now are leaving like pack rats when they should be putting and ploughing money, ploughing their profits back into exploration. As far as I am concerned and as far as the people of this province are concerned, it's time that we got a little bit of the gravy rather than the gravy all being turned over to the corporations, such as Imperial and Gulf and Shell.

Mr. Speaker, crude oil production is declining and the decline is accelerating according to a report from the Department of Mineral Resources. The report goes on to say that it will continue to decline unless new reserves are found. It is quite apparent that private industry is not interested in exploring for new reserves. Therefore, this Government saw its responsibility and is taking the initiative.

Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on one more area before taking my seat, that being the ever increasing cost of living. In this regard I am pleased to see the Throne Speech refer to a housing corporation. This corporation will greatly aid low-income families in obtaining adequate housing and reasonable down payments and reasonable interest rates. By owning their own homes through this corporation they will have a considerable saving from exorbitant rental fees which they are paying at the present time. I think too the shift in taxes will greatly assist low income families, if you have been listening to the true facts. Unlike those we hear from the Leader of the Opposition and the Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane), you will know that low-income families will not be affected by the increase in personal income taxes, however, they will still receive a substantial boost through the Property Improvement Grant. Mr. Speaker, that I say is cutting down in the cost of living in the proper areas, the areas where it is most needed in the low income groups.

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition would like to play down the effect of the Property Improvement Grants. When they were the government they had a scheme of, I think it was something like Homeowner Grants, which amounted to about \$60 or \$70, but was restricted to homeowners only. Our program is bold and new and covers homeowners and farmers and small businessmen. This, Mr. Speaker, is the most popular program this Government has ever embarked upon.

I note with keen interest that the Federal Government has set up a new committee to investigate the rising prices of some products. I certainly welcome this committee and anything is better than nothing. That is what we have seen for the last 10, 20 in fact 100 years from the Federal Governments.

I am very sceptical, however, about this committee because I don't think the Liberals and Tories on this committee really want to hit their corporate friends when it comes to exorbitant profits.

An Hon. Member: — They'll blame the farmer!

Mr. Cody: — Sure they'll blame the farmer. If this committee, Mr. Speaker, is to work effectively it must be on the same line and on the same tune as the New Democratic Party's proposal for a prices review board. This committee must have teeth and be given the power necessary to do that job and not be just one more ineffective dominated Liberal organization. Mr. Speaker, I would hope in the very near future our Government will embark on a prices review board, similar to that set up by the Hon. Dave Barrett in British Columbia. The time has come when we must bring profits, wages and prices into their proper perspective. There is no doubt some wage earners would receive substantial increases in order to have the same purchasing powers as their counterparts. Some wage earners I am sure would stay at par but it is quite obvious profits would be trimmed drastically.

It is quite obvious that institutions such as banks, finance companies and machine companies which are making large profits, \$50 million to \$60 million a year, could be trimmed and add to the ever increasing cost of living. Mr. Speaker, I urge this Government to set up a prices review board and as well place the most possible pressure on the Federal Government to put teeth into the committee which they have set up and to expand its powers so that we can once and for all get to the root of the problem of the ever-increasing cost of living.

Mr. Speaker, there are many things one could say about the Throne Speech, there are many things that will affect my constituency in Watrous, and which the people in the Watrous constituency will be proud to see. However, there are many more speakers and I am most anxious to listen to the Hon. Member who is smiling from Lumsden (Mr. Lane).

An Hon. Member: — That will be enlightening.

Mr. Cody: — Will it ever be enlightening. So, therefore, Mr. Speaker, in keeping with our election platform in 1971, I know the people of Watrous constituency will be pleased for the great benefits

that they will reap through this Throne Speech and I will support the motion and I certainly will not support the amendment.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

The Assembly recessed until 7:00 o'clock p.m.

Mr. W.A. Robbins (Saskatoon Nutana Centre: — Mr. Speaker, it was really my intention to be speaking in the debate prior to supper but the House Leader assured me that the galleries would be full this evening and therefore we deferred it until 7:00 o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to participate in the Throne Speech Debate in this Third Session of the Seventeenth Legislature. In a general way the Throne Speech outlines the policies the Government intends to introduce in the current Session. The document therefore, Mr. Speaker, merits careful perusal of all Members of this Assembly.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate my colleagues, the Hon. Member from Saskatoon Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) and the Hon. Member from Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross), the mover and the seconder in the Throne Speech for it is obvious that both of these Members have made commendable contributions to the debate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — I should also like to congratulate the Hon. Members from Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski), Biggar (Mr. Cowley), and Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) upon their appointments to the Cabinet since the last session of this House. I am positive that these Members will make a very capable contribution to the welfare of this province through the offices they hold.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: Mr. Speaker, I would probably be remiss if I did not take time to congratulate the Hon. Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who may be back in Athabasca right now, for he is not in his seat, on his re-election to this Assembly in the recent by-election. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) contended that the success of the Hon. Member for Athabasca in gaining re-election was attributable to the number of Government Members who campaigned against him. In this respect, Mr. Speaker, I cannot be credited with his success. I did not campaign against him, and I think it goes without saying, I did not campaign for him. Nevertheless, congratulations on his success at the polls are in order. Perhaps I should have gone North and written a verse or two. In that case poetic licence might have resulted in poetic justice and the Hon. Member might not have been elected. Since I didn't participate in the by-election and didn't write any poetry for that by-election perhaps I may be privileged to deliver one now. I would title this bit of verse, "The Athabasca By-election or Garrulous Guy Gallops South to Greener Pastures":

This story is singularly sad, simple but true

We had a new contest, what else could we do?
The campaign was short, financed on the cuff
The Member who won it, has proved mighty tough.
He humbly acknowledges accolades from his mates
We knew he would get them — the fact is — it grates.
It's hard on our nerves, our pride and our purse
It happened despite us, and to make matters worse
It was just a case of plans going awry
Now we have to put up with that "questionable Guy."
We don't like it, but so what — we'll survive
And polish him off in the year 75.
For the present, we'll swallow our pride and in chastened chagrin
Wish him good luck, 'cause the blighter' got in.

Congratulations, Mr. Speaker, are also in order for the Government and its leader the Hon. Premier (Mr. Blakeney) for the preparation and presentation of the legislative program contained in the Throne Speech for the current Session. It reveals initiative and innovation, potential and progress for development in this province, both economically and socially.

Mr. Speaker, Saskatchewan is noted for its pioneering and progressive legislation and this Government and its predecessors of similar political persuasion are no exception to that rule. Opposition Members, Mr. Speaker, like to give almost pontifical praise and promotional pre-eminence to the Hon. Otto Lang, the one and only Liberal Member in this province to win election in the October 30th federal balloting. If the Hon. Leader of the Opposition gloats, which he appears to do, on the reduction in the number of Saskatchewan seats held federally by New Democrats, one wonders at his reaction to the general rejection of Liberal Party candidates, not only in this province, Mr. Speaker, but throughout Western Canada. I presume, Mr. Speaker, he can argue that the Liberal federal representation in Saskatchewan did not decline. If he can find solace in that statistical fact he is certainly entitled to it.

The farm economy has improved basically because of a demand for cereal grains from overseas, particularly from Russia and China. Members of this House will recall when T.C. Douglas, a former Premier of this province and M.J. Coldwell, then Federal leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, advocated recognition of China and extension of credits to these potential overseas customers to enable them and other countries to purchase our grains. Liberal spokesmen condemned them, accusing them of having communistic leanings.

Now that the Federal Liberal Government some 25 years or more later has recognized the government of China and established diplomatic relations with that country, we are supposed to reverently roundelay the prophetic insights of the Prime Minister and his Minister-in-charge of the Canadian Wheat Board. Electors would do well to recall the facts of history and realize that such late-comers show limited leadership and deserve little credit for their belated conversion to economic realities.

Otto Lang was the architect of the LIFT program in 1970 — lower inventories for tomorrow. It is probable that this country will be without a reasonable stockpile of grain by the end of the current crop year, that is July 31st next. If we should produce a below average crop in 1973, and that is always a probability, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps a greater probability

after a series of well above average crops, we shall be crediting the Hon. Otto Lang with the 'NIL' program — No Inventories Lang. It is always dangerous to limit the production of cereal grains. Grain can be readily stored. It cannot always be produced in the desired volume or quantity.

The LIFT program is a particularly good example of economic misjudgement and mismanagement.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Should we run into grain production difficulties in the current year and a 1973 Federal election materializes, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition may well see Liberal federal representation in Saskatchewan decline to nil (no incoming Liberals).

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — The Saskatchewan Government is to be commended for its proposed FarmStart program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — The Opposition decries Saskatchewan's hesitation in co-operating with the Federal Small Farms Development Program. Why shouldn't we be somewhat suspicious of federal agricultural proposals and policies? LIFT and the Liberal Gains Income Stabilization Plan are not conducive to building confidence. The consistency of poor judgement in formulating agricultural policies for the West makes caution and care essential requirements in the integration of federal plans with provincial programs.

I know one could argue almost endlessly in relation to the Land Bank and the Federal Small Farms Development Program. However, I have here a brochure entitled 'New Opportunities for Developing Farmers' issued by the Department of Agriculture federally, wherein they give an example of a farmer who buys a piece of land for \$16,000. The interest rate is seven per cent. There is no payment on principal in the first year. And then for 25 years the individual pays \$640 per annum on principal and of course, seven per cent on the outstanding balance. I made some computations relating to this and used the same figures, \$16,000 in terms of the cost of land, based on a Land Bank rental lease at five per cent. The differential per year is \$374. That differential is the differential between principal and interest under the Small Farms Development Program based on the seven per cent interest payment and the five per cent rental lease agreement under the Land Bank. The total amount payable on the purchase of that land would be \$30,516 of which \$14,516 would be interest and of course, \$16,000 on principal. On the Land Bank lease arrangement \$20,800 would be expended in the same 26-year period. Taking that differential of \$374 and assuming that the individual invested that sum of money at seven per cent compounded annually over that 26-year period, he would accumulate sufficient money (\$38,361) to buy at current annuity rates a pension of \$300 per month for the rest of his life. A payment, Mr. Speaker, of \$36,000 on a ten year guarantee basis, automatically attached to that contract, or a payment of \$54,000 if the individual lived 15 years or a payment of \$72,000 if he

lived 20 years. Obviously reasoned utilization of that sum of money would result in a much better position for that individual at retirement. Mr. Speaker, those figures are computed on the basis of early retirement assuming the individual purchased the land under the one proposal at age 30 or conversely rented it under the Land Bank at the same age of 30. There would be 26 years to retirement in each case.

Mr. Speaker, the Saskatchewan Housing corporation which is proposed in the Throne Speech will prove useful in terms of improving accommodation for Saskatchewan residents and it will provide employment opportunities. We also look on this program as a means of improving community facilities and the quality of life.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — I am particularly pleased that housing co-operatives will be encouraged in this proposal. Participation at the local level is essential for reasoned success. Man needs participation and involvement in an increasingly faceless and technological society. The human aspect is important and social benefit must take precedence. Cost alone must not be the only criterion and economic efficiency may well be improved with local participation. Senior citizens are, under the same program, eligible for renovation and repair assistance to their residences which will additionally add to community improvement.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech makes reference to industry and tourism and these are to be given added emphasis and encouragement. Other governments have had similar aims. Progress is not as rapid as we have desired. However, I will recall to your mind the fact that the back-room boys, the bright boys, one of them including the Hon. Member from Lumsden (Mr. Lane) of the Liberal Party from 1964 to 1971 discovered no magical formulas in either of those areas. General condemnation is simply a waste of time. Constructive suggestions are welcome and should be offered by Opposition Members.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) followed the clearly predictable Liberal path of condemning public participation in resource development. A publicly owned gas and oil corporation is almost automatically condemned. Any Government Member could have predicted what the stance of the Opposition would be. Yet a Liberal administration in Ottawa owns 45 per cent of Pan Arctic Oil. In fact, it owns the controlling interest set up in conjunction with a consortium of 20 participating oil companies. Socialistic, certainly, successful to some degree, yes. Why should a similar organization in Saskatchewan be automatically condemned? The logic of the Leader of the Opposition defies logic.

An Hon. Member: — It provides an explanation anyway.

Mr. Robbins: — Public participation by the Federal Government, no doubt, is classed as public ownership. But public participation by the Provincial Government is socialistic and therefore, according to him, doomed to failure. Logical, not at all. Liberal logic, Mr. Speaker, totally illogical.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Government proposals to control election expenses and improve the representation by population principle in elections should receive the unqualified support of every Member of this House. What is it, Mr. Speaker, that worries the Opposition Members in this respect. It is obvious election expenses are getting out of hand. The last federal election is estimated to have cost in excess of \$40 million. No one should be able to obtain public office by the power of his purse. They know it. We know it. The difference between us is that we intend to do something concrete about it.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — Mr. Speaker, Members in the Opposition try to make a great deal of the proposed increase in income. We said we would increase income taxes. We said that we would do this because it is based on the principle of ability to pay. As usual, Mr. Speaker, the Members of the Opposition mislead the public in this respect. I heard the Hon. Member for Cannington (Mr. Weatherald) make a statement not too long ago with respect to the income tax rate last year which changed from 34 to 37 per cent in relation to the provincial tax related to the federal tax. He knows that is a misrepresentation because it is based on a different exemption base. The fact of the matter was that the exemptions which had been \$1,000 for single people, \$2,000 for married people were raised to \$1,500 for single persons and \$2,850 for married persons and the 37 per cent on those new exemption-based rates meant less revenue for this province than the 34 per cent previously in effect. They know it but they purposely attempt to mislead the public in this respect.

We have announced an increase from 37 per cent to 40 per cent of the federal rate, effective January 1, 1973. If one makes a few simple calculations it will clearly be indicated that that is not a large increase in tax. If, for example, any Members across the way paid \$1,000 in income tax to the Federal Government last year they would pay \$370 to the Provincial Government. This year they will pay \$1,000 assuming the federal rate stays the same and \$400 to the Provincial Government. The difference of \$30 is a very minor increase in relation to total income. I do not know if any Members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, pay that much tax. From their contributions to debate in this House one could certainly conclude they do not earn sufficient to pay tax at that rate.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Robbins: — We said we would shift the tax and we are shifting it. I know it is a strange political stance to the Opposition, to find out that people make promises and carry them out. Nevertheless this is our policy and we will continue to follow it.

Mr. Speaker, superannuated public servants and teachers who are suffering economically from the inflation which Prime Minister Trudeau claims was eliminated in 1970, and is therefore, according to him, currently non-existent, will receive some assistance from the Saskatchewan Government. We will not however, solve the problems in pensions, in reasonable measure,

until we vest and lock in pension contributions for future pension when terminations occur. In this manner, assuming proper funding, the individual will secure a pension for his period of service with each and every employer who employed him during his productive years. He will receive that pension when he attains pensionable age.

The basic problem in our society lies in mobility. The mobility problem is real and it is here. It is with us. Many assume portability will solve the problem. It will not. Portability without restriction on forfeiture, means nothing. Restriction on forfeiture would render portability totally redundant. If we had achieved early vesting and lock in on pension schemes in this country 30 years ago, a goodly number of the problems we are currently confronted with in relation to pensions and superannuated persons would be eliminated.

These problems are with us and they are horrendous problems, Mr. Speaker. We must make a start in solving them. Early vesting and proper funding will not completely meet the problem because of inflationary trends. Inflation, however, is basically the responsibility of national and international authorities.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, I welcome assistance to superannuated personnel, but I warn that it is a temporary "band aid" approach. It is not a solution and, in fact, it is really a kindergarten approach to an adult problem.

Mr. Speaker, I could comment on other aspects of the Throne Speech but there is little doubt that other Members of this Assembly will cover them in some considerable detail. However, I should like to make some reference to the proposed intersessional committee on Highway Safety.

We need not be surprised by the mounting death toll on our highways. Reduction in the age of majority, with liquor readily available to the populace generally and a measurement in relation to alcohol content in the blood of .08 as a classification of impairment is a basic reason for this mounting toll. I urge Government authorities, in conjunction with other jurisdictions, to lower the permissible alcohol content in the blood to .04 as a classification of impairment. Medically speaking, I am informed, .02 indicates some measure of impairment. Suspensions for impaired driving should remain suspensions. This is one place where I agree with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart). I find myself in very poor company I might say, but nevertheless I do agree in this respect.

While I do not believe that any chronological age constitutes maturity, the statistics clearly reveal that the increasing total of fatal accidents is predominately in the younger age groups. We should not ignore the statistical factual data available to us. Reputable statisticians do not indulge in unwarranted manipulation of data nor do they stoop to chicanery to produce the answers they want rather than the true answers in the data that await discovery.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend the Government for special attention to the Centennial celebrations of the RCMP and the Silver Broom International Curling Championships which will take place in the current year. All Members, Mr. Speaker, will, I am certain, welcome the Royal visitors to our province in July of 1973.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I again commend the Government for its progressive legislative program as outlined in the Speech from the Throne. I will oppose the amendment and support the main motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. M. Feduniak (Turtleford): — Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I stand up to congratulate the mover and the seconder in the manner they moved and seconded the Throne Speech. They both did a splendid job.

I should also like to congratulate the three Ministers appointed to the Cabinet. It is also a pleasure to be able to stand up and remind the public about our performance as a Government. \

Mr. Speaker, we made a commitment to the people of Saskatchewan. We are proud to talk about the programs which we promised and we are well on the way to carrying them out.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Some have already been implemented and some are in process now and will be in effect in due course. Mr. Speaker, you very well remember that Saskatchewan, by the end of 1970 was in a state of gloom and doom. The economic situation fell to a very low ebb. I will not say much more about it because sure nobody in Saskatchewan will forget it ever.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Mr. Speaker, when you consider that our Government took on the administration of the Liberal regime who used such careless practices in the give-away policies of our natural resources to the large foreign corporations, giving them special concessions and reducing fees. This reduced our income from the natural resources to a very low level.

Mr. Steuart: — Tell them not to use such big words.

Mr. Feduniak: — Mr. Speaker, with our new programs, this discrimination will be corrected. So far some corrections are already made, so that all our people will be able to enjoy more benefits forthcoming out of our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, I will mention some of the highlights in the economy of Saskatchewan. Since we took over in 1971 net farm income was one and a half times larger than the depressed level of 1970. In 1972 it has risen by a further 25 per cent for a total of \$586 million. That was still a result of a general trend from the NDP Government of 1964.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — In the commercial area, it

has increased by 30 per cent. In total the province's economy has grown by 9 1/2 per cent. During 1972, 21 companies expanded their business by enlarging premises and adding equipment amounting to \$29,952,000. Nine new projects spent \$3,812,000 — six expanded giving no cost. Empty wagons make the most noise.

Do you remember all the loud noises that were made by the Members on the opposite side of the House about Degelman Manufacturing, Regina, and Smith-Roles of Saskatoon moving out of Saskatchewan. Remember they had Smith-Roles plant moved to Edmonton. I should like to ask them if they can tell us where Degelman Industries and Smith-Roles Company are located today?

Mr. Speaker, we had an increase of 11,518 more vehicle registrations in Saskatchewan in 1972. During the Liberal rule in 1970, there was a decrease of 7,958 vehicles in that year. It is noted that our accidents have increased during 1972. Perhaps the increased number of vehicles explains the increased accidents. This does not necessarily mean that we had more accidents per capita.

Mr. Speaker, according to the economic overview the prospects for 1972 are as follows: unemployment will be down from 4.3 per cent to 3.7 per cent — remarkable considering the increased work force in Saskatchewan. Estimated personal income will be a record of \$3 billion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Net value commodity production increased from \$1,330 million in 1970 to \$1,763 million in 1971, an increase of \$433 million. 1972 estimated \$2 billion, which will be an increase of \$237 million. You better takes notes now, Davey.

In agriculture 1971, the net farm income was \$356 million, almost twice that of 1970. 1972 estimates are \$450 million, an increase of \$94 million. Value of mineral production in 1971 — \$429 million; 1972 estimate \$440 million — an increase of \$11 million. Oil production, development and exploration 1970 — \$201 million; 1971 — \$219 million; 1972 estimated \$210 million — an decrease of \$9 million, because the corporations are dragging their feet here.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Our Government is looking at alternatives. Electric power in 1970 — 5,988 million KWH; 1971 — 6,039 million KWH; 1972 estimate — some increase.

Manufacturing 1970 — \$545 million; 1971 — \$576 million — an increase of \$31 million; 1972 estimate \$605 million — an increase of \$29 million.

Construction and housing 1970 — \$475 million; 1971 — \$524 million — an increase of \$49 million; 1972 estimate \$550 million — an increase of \$26 million; 1970 there were 1,743 units built; 1971 there were 3,560 units — an increase of 1,817 units.

Retail trade — 1970 — \$1,018 million; 1971 — \$1,139 million — an increase of \$121 million; 1972 — \$1,275 million — increase of

\$136 million.

Farm implement sales — 1972 record breaking sales beyond \$100 million. Could it be the Farm Protection Bill? The Liberals call this stagnation!

We are pulling this province out of the gutter that they put it in. We are making spectacular gains on all fronts. Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition quoted in his speech on Tuesday last, that the Provincial Liberals did not agree with the Federal Liberals. I don't blame him. They are beginning to mellow and are admitting and accepting our programs. In other words, they are ashamed of their Liberal dictatorial policies and platform and would like to steal ours.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Mr. Speaker, I should like to inform the Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) that he has just as much chance of becoming Premier of Saskatchewan as he has growing hair on the palm of his hands.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — I believe he would stand a very good chance in Hollywood when they run out of applicants.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Mr. Speaker, I must mention the British Columbia election. Many people were astonished at the outcome and the results of the B.C. election. I have made some analysis on the B.C. election. I have found the one important issue that changed the administration from the Social Credit to the NDP was the fact that when the Liberals drove out of Saskatchewan some 123,000 people, most of these people ended up in British Columbia.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — These are the people who all voted NDP.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — They knew what the NDP had done for Saskatchewan in the 20 years. They also knew what the Liberals had undone in seven years.

Mr. Speaker, I should at this time like to congratulate Premier Barrett for his success and for his rapid action taken to correct the deplorable situation that existed in British Columbia. I was particularly interested in the Government Auto Insurance Program. Mr. Speaker, it was of interest to note that when this program was announced by the Government on January 2, 1973, the private insurance companies launched a \$100,000 publicity campaign to combat the introduction of the government car insurance program in that province.

Mr. Mostoway: — \$100,000 less for you fellows.

Mr. Feduniak: — Where do you suppose they got the money?

Mr. Speaker, I want to say something about the federal grants. The Liberals have been saying, and one of the opposite Members made mention during the last session, that it was the grants from Ottawa that kept us financed. When they say this, I say they are completely ignorant and misinformed to make statements of this nature. Mr. Speaker, I must inform them that every dollar that Ottawa pays out in grants comes from every province. As a matter of fact we only get a very small portion of the money that we pay into the federal arena. Did you know that, Davey?

Mr. Steuart: — No, I didn't.

Mr. Feduniak: — As a matter of fact we can only thank our diplomatic and able Premier, Mr. Blakeney, for his understanding and convincing attitude who is able to get more of our share from Ottawa than even the Liberals could.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — It is our own money and we certainly do not make any excuses or apologies asking for it.

Mr. Speaker, in the House I have heard several times from the senior Opposition Members that we read our speeches. Well, at least we can read. I notice that all the junior Members, who do not make many, also read their speeches.

Mr. MacDonald (Milestone): — Can't you read that?

Mr. Feduniak: — Don't judge everybody by yourself.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — With the exceptions of the odd ones who don't have to read their speeches because they have repeated the same old lines over and over so many times

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — they must have memorized them. If I may use my friend, Mr. Larson's phrase, "They are the old gramophones playing the same old record over and over without changing the needle." As long as they keep this up we really don't have an opposition.

I often wonder what they really think, but on second thought a person has first to have a mind in order to think with.

Mr. Speaker, on January 26th the Leader of the Opposition stated that the socialists are great gamblers with other peoples' money, but they are not willing to gamble their own. Mr. Speaker, when he was in charge he did nothing else but spend and gamble with the people's money. Let me ask him whose

money did he use when he financed the Prince Albert Pulp Mill? Whose backing did he use to back the \$50 million loan for the same outfit? Whose \$5,300,000 did he use to build roads for the Pulp Mill? Whose money will be used to cover the \$3,800,000 loss incurred by the forest products supplying pulpwood to the P.A. Pulp Mill in 1971?

If you Liberals believe so strongly in free enterprise, why don't you stick to your theory? Why do you apply socialism to the rich and giant corporations? On the other hand you apply capitalism to the sick and the poor.

Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, who calls himself a smart businessman, the great administrator, he could not run his own business successfully and would have starved if it hadn't been for Regina. He attempted to build a saw mill at Big River at an estimated figure of \$259,000, which now costs our Government, or our people, \$900,000 in order to bring it to the designated production capacity. Was it possible, Mr. Speaker, that it was to sabotage the Timber Board operation, or is it that he is just that simple and doesn't know it?

Mr. Speaker, our Government seriously recognizes the fact that in order to correct the unemployment and business problems in our province we must proceed with the developing of our natural resources into a finished product here in Saskatchewan, rather than just market Our resources in the raw form.

Mr. Speaker, it disturbs me to know that foreign companies like the Simpson Lumber Company from Seattle, USA, which Liberals gave special concessions to, by phasing out some Timber Board operations in Saskatchewan, to give Simpson Lumber Company the timber monopoly. At this point I should like to make reference to our Timber Board operations at Reserve, Saskatchewan, south of Hudson Bay. This project was one which showed the largest return in percentage to the people of Saskatchewan of any Timber Board operations, but the Liberals closed it, sold the equipment and left the small community destitute. 130 jobs were lost, homes were abandoned. Mr. Speaker, this Simpson Lumber Company takes out 420 thousand board feet of lumber daily or 95 million a year. This whole operation only provides 205 jobs. Back in the '50s when lumber wholesaled to the stores at \$40 a thousand the fees were \$6 per thousand. On the basis of these figures when the same lumber is now being sold to the stores at \$100 per thousand, the fees should be \$15 a thousand. But the Liberals set the basic fee for Simpson Lumber Company at \$4 per thousand.

Mr. Speaker, according to the latest 1972 annual report by the Saskatchewan Department of Natural Resources, the Simpson Lumber Company only paid \$314,337.22 in timber fees in the year 1972. If you take their one year's production of 95 million board feet of lumber, we only received \$3.31 fee per thousand board feet. Besides this, they did not contribute any money towards the fire protection levy. This, Mr. Speaker, is one of the Liberal policies that we have to correct. In addition, they allowed them to harvest the best timber to be cut into 2 x 4 x 8 foot studs. In the USA and British Columbia where the timber replacements and potential is so much greater than in Saskatchewan, they do not allow any timber to be harvested for 2 x 4 x 8 foot studs Over 9 inches in diameter. Did you know that?

Mr. Speaker, the same practices of illegitimate harvesting were allowed at the Meadow Lake mill and the Prince Albert Pulp Mill, including the MacMillan Bloedel operation.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that our Government is going to take some action to correct this. Think of what it would have done if our own people were harvesting our timber and other natural resources. The employment opportunities would triple. The proceeds of the sale of the products would put millions of dollars into the hands of our people in Saskatchewan. This money would be available to spend and help all other businesses. Mr. Speaker, besides the Government would have saved millions of dollars in special concessions given to foreign investors. The Member from Prince Albert West (Mr. Steuart) said that he gets nervous when the NDP help our own people. Is it because he is not handing it to the giant corporations? I wonder why?

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to hear that some settlement has been reached to end that terrible war in Viet Nam.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — When we analyze that war in Viet Nam and realize the waste and the suffering it has created, it is sad and alarming. There were some 45,000 young Americans who lost their lives. They made the supreme sacrifice. In addition to the thousands who were wounded, about half of these critically, many were permanently handicapped for the rest of their lives. All this does not stop here because each one of these men involves many more people — parents, wives, children, relatives and friends — many of these will be affected with grief and sorrow for the rest of their lives.

Mr. Speaker, this is the result of a capitalistic society under which some of these young men had no choice or decision of their own for the destiny and future of their very precious lives.

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that a country should not intervene if they know that a smaller country is attacked and that their freedom may be in jeopardy. I believe they should if this type of a situation presents itself and the country intervening knows that the action of the aggressor may interfere with freedom and democracy in the country concerned. Should they take action to help the attacked country? They should automatically mobilize all their resources. This should involve not only young men, but all materials and funds of the rich as well. During this period all concerns should be limited to a very small percentage of profit, or no profit at all would be more logical.

Mr. Speaker, while these young men were giving up their lives, back at home in the USA giant corporations were making record profits. If your life was involved, which would you give up, if you were given a choice?

Mr. Speaker, listening to the Leader of the opposition and his reference to us as socialists, repeatedly, I believe it would be in order to interpret the meaning of socialism, and that applies to all the Members opposite, I would suggest that you get a good dictionary. Here is what it says:

Socialism basically means to be sociable, togetherness. To share with others, to be comprehensive, interdependent, co-operative, practising division of labor, existing only as a member of compound organism. Concerned with the mutual relations of men or classes of men; agreement between men to exchange the individual freedom of the state of nature for legal restrictions, thinkers as basis of political society, politicians aiming at improving conditions of lower classes by gradual advance towards socialism, security, freedom from unemployment and want, congregation, etc.

This, Mr. Speaker, is what we, the NDP, believe in and support.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I should like to give you the definition of capitalism as described by the same dictionary. This is what the Liberals on the left believe and support:

Capitalism means possession, influence, domination, dominance of private capitalist, a person of wealth, capitalize is to arrange to use in acquiring capital, to profit by, utilize gainfully, turn to one's advantage, unscrupulous individualists and politicians

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: —

to gain by opportune use of the advantageous. In having these privileges they can control, monopolize and exploit methods, propaganda and incentives, practising, favoring or furthering capitalism.

An Hon. Member: — Recognize it Davey?

Mr. Feduniak: — Have you ever heard that before?

Mr. Steuart: — That's a good dictionary.

Mr. Feduniak: — Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Health (Mr. Smishek) made an announcement that on February 1, 1973 the people of Saskatchewan will have the privilege of having chiropractic treatments with no deterrent fees. This, Mr. Speaker, is another of our promises fulfilled. This is another program which is the first of this type in the world and it was certainly very necessary and an important thing in our health program. Chiropractic treatments was one of the very meaningful and effective categories that was missing in our Medicare program.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Many people are suffering from specific ailments, mainly dislocations of any part of the human skeleton. Victims with these problems could be, and were, hospitalized for long periods of time, utilizing our hospital beds at a great expense, without getting satisfactory and permanent recovery. These same people taking chiropractic treatments could be corrected usually in one to three treatments, depending on each individual.

Mr. Steuart: — Who ?

Mr. Feduniak: — For your information, Mr. Hon. Leader of the Opposition, I wrote my own speech.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Feduniak: — Don't ever judge everybody by yourself and your colleagues, and this I know.

Mr. Speaker, I believe chiropractic care will save our Government considerable money in our health program.

Mr. Speaker, I shall oppose the amendment and I will gladly support the Motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. D.F. MacDonald (Moose Jaw North): — Mr. Speaker, may I first congratulate the Members from Saskatoon Nutana (Mr. Rolfes) and from Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) for their contribution as the mover and seconder of this Debate. I am sure that they are proud to have this distinction at this particular Session. I will say that their presentations were excellent, even if their material was a little suspect and even though their concepts were a little ill-formed.

I should also like to congratulate the three Members who have gained Cabinet positions since the last Session. I should like to congratulate the newest Member of our caucus, the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) for taking his seat in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — He will be a valuable asset to our Party and through this Legislature will make a notable contribution to the entire province. I am proud to have spent a couple of days in his constituency during the by-election. Within the Liberal Party Allan is now known as "Avalanche Allan" and I think he deserves the nickname very well.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Although his majority was seemingly quite slim, I think it should be considered an overwhelming majority when we stop to remember that he fought a very tough campaign, put on by the NDP, and paid for to a very large extent, by the taxpayers of this province. I would have to say very honestly that as a relative newcomer to political life I was shocked at the abuse of public funds that was perpetrated by the NDP during the Athabasca by-election. Even though I was only in La Ronge for part of a week, I did in that time find that the people of that area were quite aware that the NDP were campaigning with public money. The people of the North knew that they were being bribed with their own money and they didn't appreciate it or like it one little bit. This situation, I think, was an important factor in the victory by the Liberal Party at Athabasca.

Well, Mr. Speaker, during the Throne Speech Debate we have heard a great deal about consulting the people and listening to the people and the NDP keep telling us that they are listening to the people and that they intend to listen to the people. Well, words are cheap and I think that we should judge by actions.

The Premier keeps using a cute little phrase of his own, something to this effect, that he would like to be judged by his actions. Well the Blakeney Government has used a lot of words about listening to people and I think it's about time we judged his actions. The facts quite clearly prove that the NDP are not listening to the people and there is no indication that they are likely to do so.

Mr. Messer: — Give us some indication that we are not listening.

Mr. MacDonald: — I will in a minute Jack. This revelation should not surprise anyone. You know after the Throne Speech was introduced the different media pointed out that no one should be surprised that the socialist Blakeney Government has brought in a socialist Throne Speech, and they are right and I am sure that Premier Blakeney is proud to bring in socialist measures and really no one should be surprised. By the same token no one should be surprised if a socialist government will not listen to people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — A socialist system does not work that way. They don't listen and react to the needs or desires of people, but rather the socialist decides what the people need and should have. In fact, the needs and the wants of people must not be allowed to interfere with the ideas and programs of the socialist government. Compulsion is the very heart and strength of socialism and consultation and co-operation with the people have no place in such a system.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Yet the NDP keep telling us they intend to continue listening to people. This is one of the great hypocrisies of the Blakeney Government. The Government puts on a great show of pretending to listen to people. They talk a good game but as I said words are cheap, what about actions. The Premier sets a good example for the rest of the Government. No one gets to see Mr. Blakeney except on a few specific artificially arranged occasions. He has surrounded himself with a jungle of high priced party hacks which no one can penetrate. We do see the Premier and we do hear the Premier on some occasions such as meetings and openings and press conferences and so on. But the people of this province do not have the opportunity to have him listen to them. I am sure there is no one who would argue with the fact that Mr. Blakeney is the most inaccessible Premier that our province has ever seen.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — The public are not fooled

one little bit by his show of sincerity when he made his grand tour with the Blakeney Bus. The Blakeney Bus Tour was a clever personal political tour paid for again by the public purse. Our Premier also uses another political tactic when confronted with problems. Whenever he is confronted with a problem and a need for a quick decision he immediately announces the formation of some committee or a commission or a thrust group or some such search and study group. He gives the impression of consulting with the people, while, in fact, he is doing nothing but stalling and avoiding the situation. The public attitude and stance of the Premier's lieutenant, the Attorney General (Mr. Romanow) is a good indication of how willing the NDP are to listen to people. The Attorney General listens to no one except maybe the Premier, and then I have some doubts about that. However, the Attorney General has become an expert at talking to the people. He has developed a suitable socialist vocabulary. Every time he opens his mouth he starts off with phrases like, I demand or I warn you, I won't tolerate, so on and so on. Compulsion and intimidation is the order of the day for the Attorney General. Listening or a co-operative approach is unknown to him.

Of course when we hear the word 'compulsion' we immediately think of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. Messer thinks that he has the divine power to know what people want and need. Therefore his job as he sees it is to stuff our needs and wants down our throat. Of course having this divine insight into our desires he doesn't have to listen to the people. Yet at the same time the Minister of Agriculture keeps piously saying that he is consulting with the people. He uses examples like his Land Bank meetings. Mr. Messer used these meetings to sell his Land Bank. They were nothing but political meetings. He took his outline of the Land Bank to these meetings and he heard many criticisms, but he didn't change one thing in his proposal. He didn't listen to one criticism or one suggestion. He came to those meetings to dictate to the people not to listen to the people.

Our Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder) made his position very clear at the session last year. When we asked him if he had consulted the people that would be affected by the legislation that he introduced he told us quite frankly that he had not and that he would not. In 18 months the Blakeney Cabinet has developed a justified reputation of not listening and not being accessible.

I think it was interesting to hear the remarks of the Member from Saskatoon University (Mr. Richards) this afternoon. He brought up and spoke of the suggestion that the Government should sit down and talk to Imperial Oil to iron out a certain problem. He dismissed this suggestion as not having any merit whatsoever. This attitude is typical. The Government opposite is not willing to sit down with anyone, to try and find acceptable solutions or alternatives.

In order for the NDP to give the false appearance that they are listening and consulting people, they have set up numerous legislative committees. I have to admit this is a very successful ploy used to fool the people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — A good deal more will be said later in this Session about these legislative committees. I think the very first legislative committee was a very good example. This was the committee that was used to establish an inquiry into The Family Farm Protection Act and The Compulsory Crop Insurance.

The purpose of this committee was to try and whitewash the effects of the discriminatory Family Farm Protection Act. As for the Crop Insurance portion of the committee's report, these recommendations came directly from the Cabinet via the Member for Regina North West (Mr. Whelan). These recommendations made a farce out of political hearings. The first legislative committee may prove to be the pattern. The same procedure appears to be in use right today with the Foreign Ownership of Land Committee. It appears to me that these committees may prove to be nothing more than a clever political tactic, to delude the people into thinking that they are being listened to. As I have already said there should be no surprise, a socialist system will only work by employing compulsion and force.

Dealing with the Throne Speech I will make it quite clear that I will not be supporting the Motion. First of all as a Member for Moose Jaw, I find absolutely nothing in the Throne Speech that will help in easing the problems of urban communities. The urban situation has been well presented to the Government and to the Cabinet opposite and yet this Throne Speech does not even recognize the problem. Not only are there no solutions or programs for our cities, this Government refuses even to acknowledge that problems of great magnitude do exist in the cities. I think we are a little tired of being patient, Mr. Minister of Labour (Mr. Snyder). We waited last year for some mention in the Throne Speech, there was nothing and nothing was done last year. Again this year not one single mention of urban problems. We are getting a little impatient.

I submit that no city Member can with a clear conscience support the Throne Speech.

Secondly, I cannot support the Throne Speech because it is in fact a document containing socialist measures. The NDP often talk about their mandate to act. I consider that I also have a mandate to vigorously oppose socialist programs.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — This mandate includes opposing the NDP Land Bank. It certainly includes opposing the formation of Sask Oil. It certainly includes opposing all socialist experiments that will adversely affect the people and the tax dollars in Saskatchewan.

Mr. Blakeney speaks about developing our resources for the people, by the people. It should be obvious to even the NDP that this is never the case. That old phrase for the people, by the people always turns out to be for the people by the bureaucrat. Given a choice a bureaucrat and a private developer operating under conditions set down by the people through the government, I will take the private developer every time.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Socialist experiments in

the past have shown that these methods do not work. I am not ready to turn over the development of our resources to the bureaucrats. I predict that if the NDP go ahead with Sask Oil and other like programs of resource development then our province will stagnate. I honestly believe that 20 years of CCF set this province far behind the rest of Canada and that measures proposed in this Throne Speech will do irreparable damage to our economy. I think I have a mandate to oppose these measures and I also believe that the vast majority of people in Saskatchewan vigorously oppose these measures.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. MacDonald: — Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to support the amendment and I will be voting against the Motion.

Mr. D.W. Michayluk (Redberry): — Mr. Speaker, I hope that I will not be accused by the Opposition of not being able to read a written speech. I haven't a written speech, I have no time to write it. I am going to speak in my usual manner, 'off the cuff'.

An Hon. Member: — Right from the heart.

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, may I add my voice to those who have already spoken in support of the Throne Speech read by His Honour at the opening of the Third Session of the Seventeenth Legislature only a week ago. The Throne Speech which details the plan of social legislation for the current Session, together with a blue print for the blazing of new trails for the benefit of the people of this province. Might I, Sir, add my congratulations to the Hon. Members from Humboldt (Mr. Tchorzewski), from Biggar (Mr. Cowley) and from Kerrobert-Kindersley (Mr. Taylor) on their elevation to the Ministerial posts in the Cabinet of this Government.

To this date they have demonstrated that the Premier has made a good choice for the posts and I am sure as time goes on they will prove that their ability in their positions will be proven that the choice was a right one.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — I do want to congratulate the Member for Nutana South (Mr. Rolfes) the mover of the Address-in-Reply, for the very able presentation he made on behalf of the Government. And the Hon. Member who is the youngest Member in this Legislature from Gravelbourg (Mr. Gross) who seconded the motion of the Address-in-Reply.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, there is an old proverb that says that some learn from their mistakes, others take a little longer to learn from their experience but there is another group that never learns from their mistakes, and that is the present Opposition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — I place the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) into that category, Mr. Speaker, and the rest of his crew they fit in consecutively one by one by the length of representation in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — One Liberal Leader of the Opposition at one time and the Leader of the Liberal Government believed in wind power elected for rural Saskatchewan. The present Leader believes solely in wind in his speeches.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — The present Liberal Leader is obsessed by his convictions that by giving windy speeches, devoid of rationality, logic and divorced from facts, he will convince the Saskatchewan people that he is the Messiah that will save Saskatchewan people who threw him and his government out only a little over a year ago.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — After seven years of Divine Liberal rule.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Might I, Mr. Speaker, remind the Hon. gentleman opposite and the flamboyant Leader of the Opposition, that after seven years of Divine Liberal rule the Saskatchewan electorate gave our NDP and this Government the largest popular vote that any party has received since 1917.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Steuart: Hard to believe:

Mr. Michayluk: — It is true, Dave. Six Cabinet Ministers, the Speaker of the Legislature, a clean sweep of the city of Saskatoon. And had it not been, Mr. Speaker, for the iniquitous redistribution by a commission chaired by the Hon. Leader of the Opposition, there may not have been any Opposition in this House.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

An Hon. Member: — There certainly wouldn't have been an Opposition Leader anyway.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — I, too, Mr. Speaker, should like to congratulate the newly elected Member from Athabasca (Mr. Guy). I was rather disappointed in his maiden speech.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

February 1, 1973

Mr. Michayluk: — But not surprised. I think that as time goes on he will prove himself that he has not learned anything. The hon. Gentleman was elected to this House at the same time as I was some 13 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the hon. gentlemen opposite and the Leader of the Opposition do not realize that they were thrown out by the Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — They don't realize that they are the Opposition. They can't get over the idea that their goodness to the free enterprise and because of the cruel stand for the Saskatchewan people the people chucked them out.

Mr. Speaker, you were thrown out because of the hollow promises that were made to the people in 1964 and 1967. In 1967 everything was rosy. The economy was sound, the Liberals were ready to march on. Give us another term and we will take you across the Sea of Terror. Well the electorate gave your government another mandate.

What happened in 1968? A host of promises such as deterrent fees on hospitals and doctors use. The promise of tax reduction went in reverse. The promised jobs by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition, who as the Minister of Public Health, never materialized. The 80,000 jobs were found in our other provinces, outside of Saskatchewan by Saskatchewan people.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition doesn't believe that he said some of these things. I want to remind him here this evening about one little pledge that he made just outside of my constituency in North Battleford. It appears in the New Optimist, April 29, 1966.

An Hon. Member: — Probably a socialist paper, Dick.

Mr. Michayluk: — What does it say? In bold headline form, "Steuart Predicts Drug Plan in Two Years".

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — This was 1966, you were booted out in 1971. Where was the drug plan? Here is what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said:

Health Minister D.G. Steuart, said Thursday, the Government intends to produce a provincial drug insurance program within two years. Mr. Steuart told delegates in North Battleford at the Regional Health Council Meeting that the Government had not completed plans for the program, it was in the making. But it is expected that it will be voluntary.

Well, it is still voluntary. The only difference is the price.

Mr. Speaker, our problem in this Legislature is not with the Opposition, it is the gentlemen of the Press. We can handle the Opposition very efficiently. By the doom and gloom that I can see on their faces, they are already beaten in only one week.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Our problem is with the gentlemen of the Press. I don't want to blame the gentlemen in the Press Gallery here. I am sure the gentlemen that are seated in the Press Gallery report exactly what goes on in the House. But it is the coupon clippers in the editorial rooms, these are the people that must take the blame for what appears in the pages of the Press.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — And just by giving this House what I have in mind, the first comment that came out in the Press and this is in the Leader-Post, "Throne Speech shows lack of dynamics. We are doomed to failure before we started." What did the Leader of the Opposition say? He says, "I agree with most of it." He stands on one foot for awhile until he gets a sore toe, then he gets over on the other foot, "No, I don't agree with it, No, I agree with it."

An Hon. Member: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Ultimately half the time he doesn't know or is not sure what he is saying because of political uncertainties.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that my speech is going to be rather disjointed but I hope interesting.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — The people of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, were and are familiar with the CCF and the NDP for 20 years. I well remember a Liberal Leader who used the phrase, "Sow the seed and reap the whirlwind." Mr. Tucker said that at one time. I can remember the time when that same Leader in Opposition stated, "As long as we have a CCF Government not one gallon of oil will come out of the ground in Saskatchewan." It was not long after that when the Minister of Mineral Resources took a bottle of crude and just about poured it on Mr. Tucker's head. Mr. Speaker, you may have been in this House at that time, as was the Hon. Member for Swift Current (Mr. Wood).

Mr. Speaker for 20 years the CCF and the NDP as the government, meticulously kept their pledges. This is why in 1971 prior to election we put together in book form the "New Deal for People." It makes good reading. The only difference between our 1971 program and your 1964 and 1967 program, Hon. Leader of the Opposition, is that yours is more like a fable. Our pledges are coming to fruition. What we promised in our pre-election pledges is being fulfilled. Some of them we have to come through with yet. First, the vicious deterrent fees on hospitals and doctors were removed. Every Saskatchewan

February 1, 1973

Saskatchewan resident, age 65, has received a free medical care card. On February 1, the Hon. Minister of Public Health (Mr. Smishek) has announced that chiropractic care will be an insured service under Medical Care Insurance.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — The dental program is well on its way and in a year or so Saskatchewan children up to age 12 will receive dental care at no cost to the parents.

We promised to reduce property taxes. Well probably the Leader of the Opposition thinks we should have done a little better. You know, the strange thing, Mr. Speaker, is that the Liberal Party never had in its program prior to an election that a homeowner grant would be paid to homeowners. Could one of you gentlemen show this House in your pre-election program of 1964 indication of a pledge that you would bring in a homeowners' grant program? No. This was an innovation, a slick innovation, to fool the Saskatchewan people. And then they can say, well, we're giving you \$70 with an added \$30 if we're re-elected. You didn't fool the Saskatchewan people. What did we as a government do? Well, we changed the name, we call it Property Improvement Grants. These grants are paid to all the property owners in Saskatchewan equivalent to a 13 mill tax reduction

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — up to a maximum of \$195 per farmer, \$130 for a businessman and \$78 for a homeowner. The previous grant was \$70 to a homeowner or half the tax amounting to \$18 million. The present grants go to all property owners, farm or business and amount to a 13 mill tax reduction.

In the 20 years that the CCF were the government this province implemented some of the best social legislation. The CCF pioneered legislation that has been accepted throughout Canada.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Every province has a hospitalization plan. The Canadian Government accepted and is participating financially in the hospital plan and in medicare. The Public Service in this province felt secure. I have on previous occasions risen in this House and quoted from the Public Service Employees Association publication, "The Dome", about the conditions of Public Service employees prior to 1944 and what they said about their rights, their privileges and their collective bargaining with the CCF Government during its period of 20 years.

One has to look only at education. Mr. Speaker, I superannuated from the teaching profession two years ago. I know the conditions that existed from 1933 to 1944 to 1945. I taught for as little as \$1.38 a day and I don't blame the then government for the economic conditions were beyond government control due to drought and poor crops. But I know the changes that took place in education with the introduction of the larger school units.

An Hon. Member: — They were against it.

Mr. Michayluk: — Oh, yes, they were against it, like they are the Hog Marketing Commission now.

An Hon. Member: — Area bargaining, that was another catastrophe.

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, with the introduction of the larger school units every rural boy and girl was given an opportunity for education without cost to the parents. During my days in high school when I attended a village high school a \$50 fee was charged because we were not taxpayers of this district. Because of the distance \$25 or \$30 a month had to be paid board for a ten month period. During those hard times there were many boys and girls who were unable to get education because of the economic condition.

An Hon. Member: — What year was that?

Mr. Michayluk: — Those were the Liberal years the dark years.

Mr. Speaker: — Order, order!

Mr. Michayluk: — The larger school unit gave every boy and girl in Saskatchewan the right to an education from Grades 1 to 12. The system was not completed in one year or two, it took a number of years culminating now where Saskatchewan students are rolling on wheels, a complete bussing of students to public and high schools.

Mr. MacDonald: (Milestone) — From 7 a.m. until 6 p.m.

Mr. Michayluk: — Are you against it?

An Hon. Member: — Have you got an alternative?

Mr. Michayluk: — Then one has to mention one other innovation of the Government in the 20-year period and that's the Crown corporations.

Mr. Steuart: — They're a dandy.

Mr. Michayluk: — Sure, they're a dandy. You didn't dare sell SGIO.

An Hon. Member: — They tried though.

Mr. Michayluk: — You didn't dare sell the Saskatchewan Transportation Company. You didn't dare sell the Sodium Sulphate Plant but you sold some of the reserves at 22 cents a ton. You sold NorCanAir. In looking over a government publication, Saskatchewan Industry Report, we have, "30 aircraft serve northern Saskatchewan", and it's NorCanAir. You didn't sell it, you gave it away. You sold it with a guarantee of an annual payment to NorCanAir with which they were able to pay for the corporation. Yes, NorCanAir, is one of the Crown corporations

that you gave away.

What happened to the Timber Board, the mill on the hill at Big River? You can't get the box car up and you have to haul all the logs up and then haul them down. So it's unprofitable. Next the sale of the Reserve saw mill, which was the most economic mill in the timber operation. It brought in the most revenue to the Timber Board. And then the deal with your friends, MacMillan and Bloedel. You brought in MacMillan and Bloedel but at the same time you gave away a plant at half of its original cost that belonged to the shareholders of Saskatchewan. They had borrowed money from the Government and your Government wouldn't give them a chance by extending the time for repayment and you sold it at better than 50 cents on the dollar.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — And you brag that you brought in MacMillan and Bloedel.

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and some of the Hon. gentlemen opposite are fighting now about some civil servants having been transferred to different positions in the government and departments while others have left. What happened in the period 1964 to 1971? What happened to those with administrative abilities? Some you fired because of politics. Some went to Ottawa, while others went to other provincial governments. David Cass-Beggs for example, the most eminent electrical engineer in the North American continent left. He was hired later by the Federal Government. Later he worked for the Province of Manitoba and now is employed by the British Columbia Government. But they didn't only fire our people, Mr. Speaker, they fired one ex-Liberal Cabinet Minister. A man who predicted the government downfall: "Gardiner predicts Thatcher downfall." That's one you fired, that's one of your own people. Here is what Mr. Wilf Gardiner said and may I quote, Mr. Speaker:

Personally, I think he is going to go.

Referring to the Premier and the Liberal Government.

One way or the other, either he is going to resign or be defeated in the upcoming election, he said.

Well, here is one Liberal promise that came to fruition.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — But these firings to which the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) makes reference are small in comparison to what your Government did when you were in the Government benches. You peddled petty stuff. I want to read a letter here, it's a registered letter to one of my constituents from the Treasury Department, Taxation Branch. This is addressed to one Mr. Howard Vern McArthur, Motor Licence Issuer, Meota, Saskatchewan, a man who a year or one-half year prior to the election had purchased an SGIO agency in the Village of Meota. He was also selling licence plates. It's a very minute, small thing. He paid \$2400 for the agency, he got no compensation on losing it. May I quote part of a letter:

This is to advise you that we have received Order-in-Council terminating your appointment as motor licence issuer.

An Hon. Member: — Who signed here.

Mr. Michayluk: — Well, it's not signed by any of the Ministers, it is signed by J.M. Kramer, Tax Administration Supervisor. And then another letter to the same gentlemen. I don't mind that a local committee in the community make a decision in the area. This gentleman, as I stated a few moments ago, Mr. Speaker, had paid \$2,400 for the SGIO agency. He lost it without a cent of compensation. An agent giving up his agency under political pressure should be given a chance to recoup some of his investment. This gentleman was never given this chance. Ultimately what happened is that Meota lost the SGIO agency, it was later sold to a North Battleford agency. At this time Meota and district have an SGIO agency again.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) and the Government for introducing a program Operation Open Roads and Operation Main Streets.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, I intend to bring for the Premier the picture with the bunny ears he wore at Rabbit Lake. It was a grand opening. You may recall, Mr. Speaker, and Hon. Members of this House, the time when the ex-Minister of Highways (Mr. Boldt) who unfortunately is not in this House due to his illness, said, "Not one cent for Redberry."

An Hon. Member: — That was a black day, that was arrogant I think, Dick.

Mr. Michayluk: — The same Minister who on the calling of the election in 1971 went down from the Petrofka Bridge at Waldheim selling Liberal memberships at \$5 each. He was quoted as saying that Liberal memberships sold in the area will oil a road from Highway No. 12 to Highway No. 212. Just like the Arabs, they moved in and like the Arabs, they pulled out. The road was there.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — But not one cent for Redberry.

An Hon. Member: — They gave it all to the Arabs.

Mr. Michayluk: — Mr. Speaker, they did build a part of Highway No. 4 in the Redberry constituency and The Battlefords constituency in 1964 and 1965, but the only reason it was built is that a contract was let before the Liberal Government was elected. That's all we got. However, Operation Open Roads, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Premier, was a blessing to the Redberry constituency.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — Forty-seven miles of

dust-free road. It's immaterial whether it passed by the Kramer ranch or Mr. Craig's who politically opposes Liberal and NDP politics. I want to thank the Minister and the Government for instituting this program and for giving it a start in my constituency. Forty-seven miles, serving four urban communities. A dust-free oiled road from Rabbit Lake, Mayfair, Whitkow, Redfield and Mullingar to Highway No. 4. I understand that this is not the only area or the only community in the province to benefit. The village of Rabbit Lake had its main street oiled. It was a grand day, Mr. Speaker, in Rabbit Lake on August 21st, last year with 1200 people at the opening and about 2,500 for the evening. A grand celebration. The ex-Minister of Highways had the audacity to get up in this Legislature and announce, "Not one red cent for Redberry."

Now I want to say a few words about the recreational area around two major lakes in my constituency, Jackfish Lake and Murray Lake. Jackfish Lake in particular has, on its shore, The Battleford's provincial Park. It is surrounded by some 1,300 cottages, with three commercial operators on the lake. All parties concerned have been encountering difficulties with the water level in the Jackfish and the Murray Lakes. The Jackfish Watershed Association was formed during the days of the Liberal Government. The Board has slanted representation on behalf of the farming community which I have nothing against personally. This Watershed Association has endeavored to keep the water level of Jackfish and Murray Lakes at a low level after August 1st of each year because of the flooding of some 600 acres of hay land around the two lakes.

Representation has been made to the Jackfish Lake Watershed Association and I am sure was made to the Liberal Government and to the present Government about the water level in Jackfish and Murray Lakes. Last year it was agreed, between the Watershed Association and the Government that the water would be retained at 1,738 foot level. What happened during the Liberal days was that not only the formation of the Association did not have a fair representation of all concerned, but a trench one quarter of a mile was dug and then they put in a cement flood gate that could be opened and closed. What happens, Mr. Speaker, is that in the spring when the Turtle River is at its high level and several creeks are high, someone in the area tampers with the gate releasing the water into the North Saskatchewan River.

Mr. Messer: — I bet he is a Liberal.

Mr. Michayluk: — Well, I don't know, it was someone who didn't want the water level suitable for recreational purposes. Last year when this water level was to be retained at the 1,738 foot level there was vandalism at that gate. I would suggest to the Government that something be done to create fair representation in the Jackfish Watershed Association. I suggest that giving the cottage owners and private resort operators some representation on the Watershed Association. I think I would suggest to the Minister concerned that they probably give this Association a grant to put in a concrete spillway that could not be opened so that proper level could be maintained.

Also I want to thank the Minister of Natural Resources (Mr. Bowerman) for some of the great improvements that have been made or are in the process of being constructed in The Battleford's Provincial Park, a closed guest house with barbecue pits

for patrons and on the construction of a nine-hole golf course with watered greens to be completed this year.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — May I say a few words on a topic that is not new to Saskatchewan. Since the black days of 1968 when the Liberal Government deemed it unnecessary to contact the teachers and trustees when they formulated and legislated the ‘Teacher Area Bargaining’ for salaries.

I can recall, Mr. Speaker, the debates that took place in this House on area bargaining. I well remember the remarks of the Hon. Member for Cutknife who led off in the debate, followed by the late Mr. Woodrow Lloyd. Mr. Speaker, we predicted at that time, that area bargaining would not work. Not that it would not have worked under other circumstances. It would have or may have been adequate had the then Minister of Education (Mr. McIsaac) and the Premier, and Government had the guts to do it the way the CCF brought in The Teachers’ Bargaining Act of 1949.

In the 1949 Salary Act there was unanimous agreement on the principle of the process of bargaining. The ex-Minister must assume full responsibility for forcing area bargaining without consulting the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation which represents some 11,000 teachers in this province.

I hope that before we adjourn this Session that this Government will bring in an Act that will rectify some of the divisive attitude between the organizations concerned. I superannuated several years ago due to the conditions that existed between the parents, the teachers and the trustees. The bickering in the bargaining process over salaries — which the teachers eventually got — sometimes lasted for 15 months before agreement was reached.

The Member is talking about forcing something down somebody’s throat in respect to hog marketing. Just look back at what you did, what you forced down the throat of Saskatchewan people during the time when you were the Government. I can recall when area bargaining was introduced, the chairman of the Saskatoon School Board, Dr. John Egnatoff vigorously opposed area bargaining. He was against it. I hope that the present Minister of Education (Mr. MacMurchy) and this Government uses means where they can get some useful understanding for the benefit — not only of teachers or trustees — but for the benefit of the education of our boys and girls in our schools.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. Michayluk: — I recall too when there were great pledges made to the Saskatchewan voters in respect to the reduction of power rates, gas rates. Mr. Speaker, may I quote from the Star-Phoenix of April 2, 1964 — these remarks were made at Bruno. ‘Report of meeting of Dave Steuart:’

Mr. Steuart pledged that a Liberal Government would dedicate itself by reducing power and gas rates comparable to other provinces.

Then one other gentleman who is not in his seat, the flying

February 1, 1973

Member of Athabasca (Mr. Guy) who can never be believed. Allan Guy speaking in La Ronge September 29, 1967 and reported in the Star-Phoenix:

If a Liberal Government is re-elected the Member from Athabasca said there will be a reduction in the La Ronge power rates before the end of the year.

Well, you know what happened, Mr. Speaker, to the power rates. \$10 million into the general revenues of the Provincial Treasury. Add to this the telephones — five per cent sales tax on long distance calls.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased with the Premier's remarks on the cessation of hostilities in the ravaged Viet Nam. Mr. Speaker, all Hon. Members of this Legislature that have had an occasion to see on television the total devastation, total destruction and total brutal murder of innocent men, women and children were perturbed by this brutality. My heart bled whenever I witnessed these criminal scenes. I am glad, and I pray that this peace may last for the benefit of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning I stated that I would not be accused of reading from a script. I agree with the content of the Throne Speech. The highlights embodied in the Speech from the Throne will be of benefit to the agricultural industry and to our businessmen. Our co-operatives will profit together with further development of enterprise owned by the Saskatchewan people. It is with this in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I will oppose the amendment and support the motion.

Some Hon. Members: — Hear, hear!

Mr. F. Meakes: (Touchwood) — Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to start speaking after the oratory of my hon. friend from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk). I just get up and talk.

My first words must be to congratulate the mover and the seconder. This brings honor to themselves and to the constituency. I know that their constituents will be proud of the job they did in carrying forth this duty. We, in this House, were proud of them too.

I, too, want to add my congratulations to the three new Ministers that were appointed since the last time we sat in this House. I know that they will find the job hard work, but I think they will find it fulfilling.

I should also like to congratulate the Member for Athabasca (Mr. Guy) and I wish he were in his seat, for winning the seat again. Naturally we should wish he wasn't here, but this is the democratic process and we wouldn't want it any other way.

I was amused when the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North (Mr. MacDonald) referred to him as "Avalanche Allan". You know I never saw an avalanche that did not go downhill, I am sure that he is going downhill and that next time he will be down in the ditch. He wasn't far from it today when he was speaking in the House.

I intend to divide what I have to say in this speech into four parts. I am going to deal with the Throne Speech, compare

it with the other Throne Speeches. I am going to deal with some of the remarks of the Opposition, and fourthly, I am going to discuss the speech in the light of how it affects the constituency of Touchwood.

A year ago I said that the Speech from the Throne was the best speech that I had ever heard in this House and that I believed that it was the best Speech from the Throne that had ever been delivered in the history of this province. I would say that this one comes in the same category as the one a year ago.

I look back at the seven long years of the Liberal Government and I even went to the trouble, and I would suggest it is good exercise for the Members of this House, to sit down and read the Speeches from the Throne from those seven years and then compare them with the Speech from the Throne of this year. Those seven speeches from the Throne delivered by the Liberal Government were full of gloom, doom and complaining. When you read this one it is full of enthusiasm and optimism.

I couldn't help but feel — and I know that thousands of people in this province are feeling — that Saskatchewan is surging ahead under the leadership of our Premier, Mr. Blakeney. I want to say how proud I was to be one of his Members when I listened to him the other day in his contribution in debate on this Speech. In particular I am referring to the remarks that he made in terms of DREE and his statesman-like manner in which he said it. We, in this Party, are pretty proud of our Leader. We have a group of active hard-working Cabinet Ministers and a vibrant, dynamic government. We are starting to get things done.

One of the other things that I am very proud of this Government is the setting up of the intersessional committees. I noted particularly and listened more closely, Mr. Deputy Speaker, perhaps because I was sitting in your chair and not here in my own place, the criticisms of the Hon. Member from Moose Jaw North. I say that we are a government that is listening to the people. The fact that we were sent out with committees to hold meetings across this province and later on in this Session we will have quite a bit to say about it.

I was one of the members of one of those committees. I have enjoyed the work of that committee, have enjoyed meeting the people, yes, and at times hearing the people criticize the Government, but that is a part of democracy.

I really believe that the reason that the Hon. Members on the other side of the House are complaining is they know that this type of consultation with people, this really getting the Government to go out and meet the people; will help to defeat the Liberal Party in the next election. They are objecting to the cost of it. I say that no cost is too great to make democracy work.

I listened with interest to the charges of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and the other Members who have spoken in this Debate. One of the things that amazes me that they seem to have forgotten is that they lost the election in 1971. I noticed in the Leader-Post the morning after the Leader of the Opposition spoke — and I am going to quote just a little bit:

Opposition Leader Steuart detected Premier Blakeney's true

colors in the New Democratic administration third Throne Speech since forming the Government. This is a Socialist document.

This is a socialist document! Certainly it is a socialist document. We are proud — at least I am and I know all my colleagues are — we are proud that we are democratic socialists. In the last election my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition, with his then Leader raced around this province and said — what did they say? They said, “It is going to be private enterprise versus socialism.”

Sixty Liberal candidates went around this province saying that and what happened? Forty five of those candidates were rejected.

We went out with a platform on the Land Bank, went out on a program of stopping the second pulp mill. We went out on a program of saying that we would do something about foreign ownership of farm land. We went out and we said that we would do something about secondary industry. And the people of Saskatchewan accepted our program, 45 to 15. I say I just really can't understand them, that they haven't learned a lesson. The Liberal policy hasn't changed since 1971. The people in 1971 rejected their policies overwhelmingly. The Liberal Party for many decades has supported corporate enterprise. The new Liberal Party is no different. They tried to give it the old face lifting. They used a bit of cosmetics and lipstick and artificial eyelashes but it is the same old shop-worn party. The people of this province know it and I want to suggest that as long as they keep along this road it is certainly good for us because they will be a long time out in the wilderness. This new Moses will not lead them out of it.

I am sorry the Hon. Member for Milestone (Mr. MacDonald) is not in his seat. But I hope one of his colleagues will pass on to him my thanks for him coming out into my constituency recently, meeting with those few Liberals that he could find out there. Funny the next day there were three of those people who had been Liberals who came and bought New Democratic memberships. So I want to thank him for coming out.

Let us look for a few moments at the record of this Government. I could spend days talking about it. I want to suggest that the achievements in the short 18 months have been great. And I am only going to mention a few. I shall deal with three or four departments.

I want to first turn to agriculture, because certainly this is the main industry in Touchwood constituency. I want to say that the Department of Agriculture has come to life after seven years of dormant Liberal government. There has been action in that department in a whole lot of areas. One of their early actions was to start some action on research which had completely died in those seven lean years. When there was need to supply lannate, they took action, fast action. They have taken action and there is going to be more action assisting farmers to diversify. They have started the Land Bank, it is now going, it's a popular program. And I might just say in passing, this new supposed small farm development program of federal legislation has the wrong name. It should be the Large Farm Development Act. This is what is going to happen. All you have to do is read the pamphlet that they are passing out. All you have to do is

read it and you will soon see that the little fellow is going to be bought out and the bigger fellow is going to be the one and they are just going to start getting bigger and bigger. Incidentally when you look at what they are going to be charging, I quote:

The agreement of sale gives the farmer the advantage of Farm Credit Corporation interest rates and repayment period.

That's at seven and three-quarter per cent. I want to suggest that the Land Bank Program is going to be a popular program. That of course is why my friends across the way are so anxious to try to discredit it.

We said that we would emphasize secondary industry and we are doing this and we will continue doing it. I want to congratulate the Minister-in-charge of this.

The Premier covered all this in his speech. He put on record the progress that has been made and I knew that it happened. The Opposition did sneer but I say it is far better to have a hundred employees working in 20 different places than it is to have them all working in one. This will certainly help the smaller communities. One of my colleagues mentioned the fact of the terrible row that was made in this House last year, Sir, by the Members to the left in regard to Smith-Roles. Oh, they were gone, but they are still here. Degelman Industries with presently a large building program expansion was to go.

I wish the Minister of Highways (Mr. Kramer) were here because when we were in Opposition we said we would straighten out the mess that was in the Department of Highways. I want to congratulate the Minister of Highways for starting to do that. I think he is to be congratulated and the Government is to be congratulated on the major survey of the Department. I believe it is bringing reason and common sense to that Department. I believe that it is going to bring balance and economy. In particular I want to re-emphasize the words of my hon. friend from Redberry (Mr. Michayluk) when he talked about the Open Road Program and Operation Main Street. I was really amused the other day in listening to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Steuart) and the Hon. Member from Wilkie (Mr. McIsaac). They contradicted themselves. On page 71 of that day, the Hon. Leader of the Opposition referred to it as a 'bad road policy'. On page 89 of the same day, the Hon. Member from Wilkie said the two programs were five-year old Liberal programs. I wish these two gentlemen would get together. You can't have it both ways unless my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition was saying that a Liberal program was a bad program.

Certainly if it was a Liberal program it was like a whole lot of other Liberal programs that were put forward for election time and then put away on a shelf, to be heard nothing about.

I want to say a few words about the Department of Municipal Affairs and their housing program. I think that this is a good program. The new one that is coming in, I am sure will be better. In particular I want to talk about the winter works program, where there has been over \$7 million spent in 243 applications. This has been a boom to those in need of work. It has been an assistance to the construction industry.

I want to re-emphasize that I say one of the most popular

February 1, 1973

programs that this Government has brought in is the Property Improvement Grants, which my colleague mentioned a few minutes ago. The house building assistance program is another good one. I could go on and do the same with every department. But all I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have a Government that is doing things, doing things that people want and I am proud to be a part of that.

I listened to the Leader of the Opposition and other Members, who have been running around saying, that we cry to Ottawa. I want to ask why not? Saskatchewan people pay taxes to Ottawa. And I want to suggest that this is all Canada is about. We need a strong federal government. We need a strong federal government that will equalize between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots', otherwise Canada will become balkanized. And lastly, I would say about that, that when my friend and the Leader of the Opposition were in government, I remember he used to go crying to Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, there is not very much more I am going to say tonight. I want to let my friends go, I believe they have a party they are going to or something. I have every year since I came to the Legislature reviewed conditions in Touchwood. Just in closing I want to say that it is agriculture. Certainly farmers have had more money in the last year, cattle prices have been good, grain has moved. But I want to say yes, he says, "Thank Otto." The Leader of the Opposition says "Thank Otto". Yes, we have a lot to thank Otto for. One of my colleagues said that we have LIFT to thank Otto for. But there are more and more farmers leaving the farm. The economic squeeze is on. And we are certainly going to need programs that will stop this flow and I hope also that we can bring younger people back onto the farm.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other things I want to say tomorrow, so I ask leave to move adjournment until tomorrow.

Debate adjourned.

The Assembly adjourned at 9:05 o'clock p.m.